

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

26th October 2023

Application No:	SMD/2019/0716	
Location	Moneystone Quarry	
Proposal	Retention of former laboratory building and change of use to a sports hall with climbing wall, soft play area, two-lane mini bowl, cinema room; craft room and craft store, bike store and maintenance and bike hire office, cafe, viewing area, WCs, management office and plant rooms associated with Moneystone Park external alterations and reconfiguration of existing car park to provide 24no. car parking spaces.	
Applicant	Laver Leisure (Oakamoor) Ltd	
Agent	Avison Young	
Parish/ward	Oakamoor	Date registered 29-11-19
If you have a question about this report please contact: Jane Curley tel: 01538 395400 ex 4124 Jane.curley@staffsmoorlands.gov.uk		

REFERRAL

This proposal is linked to the approved leisure development at Moneystone quarry. The application for reserved matters of Phase 1 of the leisure development, SMD/2019/0646 is also on this Agenda. The scheme is locally contentious.

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to conditions

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 This building was permitted with others on the 12th December 1994 by Staffordshire County Council under reference SM 94/852 as part of quarrying operations at the site. The description of development refers to, ‘..the erection of new buildings and demolition of redundant ones at Moneystone Quarry’.

2.2 Condition 5 of the permission states “*Within 6 months of the cessation of the winning and working of minerals at Moneystone Quarry the buildings and their foundations hereby permitted shall be removed and the site restored to agriculture/forestry in accordance with a scheme previously agreed in writing with the Mineral Planning Authority.*”

2.3 The winning and working of minerals ceased on 31 March 2011.

2.4 Planning permission reference SM.96/935 was granted on 22 May 1998 for extension and progressive restoration of Moneystone Quarry and associated matters. Condition 39 of that permission states “*Within 3 years of the cessation of quarrying or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Mineral Planning Authority all plant and buildings shall be removed from the site.*”

2.5 Quarrying ceased on 31 March 2011.

2.6 Two Enforcement Notices were issued by Staffordshire County Council on the 30th September 2021, one relating specifically to the application building. The Enforcement notice requires as follows:-

- a) For the building to be removed from the site including its foundations and all resulting debris, rubble and waste materials
Time for compliance: 3months after the Notice takes effect
- b) All hardstanding, structures, machinery and equipment removed from the land surrounding the building
Time for compliance: 3months after the Notice takes effect
- c) Restore the land to open grassland
Time for compliance: 6 months after the Notice takes effect

2.7 The initial Enforcement Notice took effect on the 30th September 2022. However, Staffordshire CC advise that following a request from Laver Leisure, the site owner, the Enforcement Notice was amended to take effect on the 31st December 2023. Everything else, they advise, is unchanged on the Notices.

2.8 If planning permission is granted, this would in effect “over-ride” the enforcement notice, albeit that the Enforcement Notice would remain in place unless Staffordshire County Council were to withdraw it at some future point.

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

3.1 This application relates to the existing laboratory building and adjacent car park and land which was, up until June 2018 used in connection with the quarry. It has since remained empty. At the time of the outline application for the leisure scheme (SMD/2016/0378) the building was still in use by Sibelco and was excluded from the application site. No part of the application site forms part of the Approved Restoration Plan for the quarry site.

3.2 The existing Laboratory consists of two elements, a lower and upper building. The buildings are at different levels, the floor level of the upper building being 1.0m above that of the lower. There is a staircase between the two levels within the link corridor.

3.3 The lower building is single storey and of predominantly brick construction under a very shallow pitched roof. It has a flat roof brick addition running along the front elevation.

3.4 The upper building is of portal frame construction, approx. 6.25m in height. It appears to have been extended in the past with a lean-to addition to the rear which follows the slope of the main roof. The walls and roof of the central portal framed element are clad in green profiled metal sheeting. There is also a flat roof brick extension at the front on this part of the building.

Overall the buildings form a ‘rectangular’ shape (approximately 56.0 x 20.0m) on plan oriented along a northwest/southeast axis.

3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

4.1 The proposal is to change the use of the building to provide leisure uses to complement and be used in conjunction with the approved leisure scheme at Moneystone quarry. Three extensions to the building are also included in the proposal equating to 22 sq m of the overall 1115 sq m of floor space (gross external). The extensions are: -

- Feature entrance and lobby set within the opening formed by the existing roller shutter door on the northwest elevation.
- Small flat roof extension to the rear to create sufficient length for the Bowling Alley.
- Additional space to the side of the stair within the link corridor to enable the inclusion of a wheelchair platform lift to allow wheelchair users access between the two levels.

4.2 24 car parking spaces are provided. The plans show the following uses

- Sport's Hall (Including Indoor Climbing Wall) - 320 sq m
- Children's Indoor Soft Play Area - 85 sq m
- Informal Screen Room - 80 sq m
- Two Lane Bowling Alley - 50 sq m
- Café Servery to Viewing Areas
- Craft Room
- Bike Hire
- Associated Viewing Areas, Stores, Toilets, Offices and Plant Rooms

4.3 The applicant provides a table within the Design and Access statement (DAS) which shows that the main uses to be provided i.e sports hall, soft play, screen room and bowling alley were all uses that were envisaged to be provided within the Hub building (see Condition 6 of SMD/2016/0378 which sets out parameters)

4.4 The conversion will involve the removal of the internal walls currently subdividing the upper building to create the Sports Hall. The Bowling Lanes and Children's Soft Play are positioned within the rear lean-to where the ceiling height remains over 3.0m. The Informal Screen Room is located within the lower building. The original toilet facilities, which serve the whole facility, have been removed and new toilets reinstated in the same location. A Bike Hire offer is also accommodated in the lower building. Minimal alterations to the single storey flat roofed brick elements around the building are envisaged with a craft room, offices, stores housed here. A new entrance feature to the building is positioned on the Northwest elevation facing towards the new Hub building.

4.5 The DAS states that the individual elements have been tested to ensure that all areas are suitably sized for their intended use.

4.6 The proposal also includes for re facing the building with a mix of timber and metal cladding with new dark grey aluminium window and door frames. The DAS refers to changing the external appearance of the building from industrial to 'agricultural'.

4.7 The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, Bat survey, Heritage Technical Note and Transport Note.

4.8 The Council issued a Screening Opinion on the 15th October 2020. This confirmed that the proposed development was not EIA development (SMD/2020/ 0243)

4.9 The full application together with all consultee responses and letters of representation can be found at the following link

<http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet>

4 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

SMD/2016/0388 Formation of a no right turn vehicular access onto Eaves Lane. Refused

SMD/2016/0378 Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access for

the erection of a high quality leisure development comprising holiday lodges; a new central hub building; (providing swimming pool, restaurant, bowling alley, spa, gym, informal screen/cinema room, children's soft play area, café, shop and sports hall); café; visitor centre with farm shop; administration building; maintenance building; archery centre; water sports centre; equipped play areas; multi-sports area; rope walks, car parking; and managed footpaths and cycleways and bridleways set in attractive landscaping and ecological enhancements. Approved

SMD/2014/0682 - Outline with all matters reserved except access for the erection of a leisure development of up to 250 lodges. Refused

5 PLANNING POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

The Development Plan comprises of

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan (September 2020)

The following policies are relevant to the application: -

- SS1 Development Principles
- SD1 Sustainable Use of Resources
- SD3 Sustainable measure in development
- SD4 Pollution and Water quality
- SS10 Rural area strategy
- SS11 Churnet Valley Strategy
- DC1 Design Considerations
- E3 Existing employment areas, premises and allocations
- C1 Creating Sustainable Communities
- NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
- NE2 Trees, Woodland and hedgerows
- T1 Development and Sustainable Transport
- T2 Other Sustainable Transport Measures

National Planning Policy NPPF

National Planning Policy Guidance

6 CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

Press Notice expiry date: 8th January 2020

Site Notice expiry date: 8th January 2020

Objections (76)

- Both the 0716 and 0725 applications are admitted to fall outside of the red line boundary of the approved SMD/ 2016/0378 outline planning permission. They therefore fall to be screened under the EIA Regulations.
- Outline permission has never covered use of the hub building in the new development, or cutting through bedrock.
- The hub building was supposed to be demolished following the Restoration and After Care Plan
- Reports not made available to planning authorities

- Screening report makes false claims – e.g. the majority of proposed uses are already approved
- The ecology situation has evolved – data is too old
- The EIA screening assessment applies the test of ‘significant environmental harm’ – a more sensitive test should be applied
- Twice in the last approximate six months Severn Trent have been called out to repair pipes connecting Q2 & Q3
- Q3 is much fuller than at the time outline permission was granted – increases instability
- The area is prone to local landslips due to the Westphalian Coal Fault
- Moneystone Quarry has been sinking slowly into the River Churnet over recent years, threatening local settlements
- 31 lodges are planned to sit below the current water line and rest on piers in the water – this is dangerous and will be unstable on thixotropic sand – higher lodges also on thixotropic sand may slide down to the reservoir
- Risk of saturation to soft rock such as sandstone – will disintegrate
- Tsunami risk to lakeside lodges following landslide into lake
- The Committee were not informed of quarry instability when passing outline permission
- Time must be allowed for investigation of newly available information
- Planning hi Arboricultural and Woodland Trust opinions do not concur
- Land once part of Frame Wood - Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites – has residual soil value and needs protecting. Buffer zone must be extended
- Potential archaeological remains in ancient woodland
- story omitted from screening report
- WT Planners Manual for Ancient Woodland plainly not consulted
- Need an up to date and full tree survey
- No evidence has been advanced in the AIA that any assessment of the impact of ammonia on the ancient woodlands of Frame Wood and Key Wood – at risk from vehicle emissions
- No attempt to identify veteran trees, or mention of below ground ecosystems
- Prior to quarrying Stream A rose high on the adjoining hillside, some distance from the quarry. Since quarrying blocked the direct route of the stream its catchment must now ‘discharge’ in part into other adjacent streams with the remainder diffusing into Quarry 3. Although there is some probable, additional diffusion coming into Q3 from Quarry 1 (Q1) that is located at a nearby significantly higher level, there is no confirmation in the application’s documentation that once Q1 is developed that the water flows into Q3 will be maintained and that the raising of Q3 to AOD 156 will be enough to supply sufficient water for the future needs of the Whiston Eaves SSSI
- Q3 has been recommended without the EA having any knowledge of a Phase 2 development and as such the EA advice may well be insufficient to adjudicate the effects on Q3 of any permanent change in water levels. Q3 may well need a further rise in water levels in order to maintain the required water flows through Whiston Eaves SSSI
- Former workers at the quarry were worried about the dangers of using the quarry for this sort of development because of the instability of the of the ground and weakness of the rock. I am mindful of the recent landslip and sink hole nearby in Oakamoor.
- Concerns regarding stability and long term safety risk
- Failed to meet the adopted (2014) SMDC Core Strategy and specifically its Spatial Objectives as set out in paragraph 8.1.7 . (SS1)
- Concerns regarding protection of great crested newts, bats, reptiles, peregrine falcons, and Red Kites creating a cumulative impact.
- Legal duty to restore the site not fulfilled. The applications The Restoration and After Care Plan.
- The applications fail to meet the Conditions and Reasons that attach to the overarching planning permission SMD/2016/0378

- The applications fail to meet the concerns of Natural England and the SWLT
- The applications put at risk the evidence of a resurgent palette of endangered wildlife at and surrounding MQ
- The applications lay outside of the Red Line Plan and put at risk the integrity of the whole of the restoration and after care plan
- The applications go against the SMDC Core Strategy Plan 2014 and its policies
- They put at risk the National, regional and District obligations to reduce carbon emissions and meet the obligations of the Paris Climate Accord recently endorsed by the Supreme Court
- New plans filed on 13/08/2020 do not relate to those from the outline permission.
- The SMDC is bound by the legal provisions established by Paris ClimateChange Accord which has been the law in the UK since it was ratified into law in November 2016. Ignorance to the law has never been excused. the case before the Court of Appeal made public on Thursday 27th. February 2020 under the reference number C1/2019/1154 [2020] EWCA Civ 213 and referred in the media as the case of Heathrow -v- Friends of the Earth did not change the law which has remained the same since November 2016. On any applications determined since 2016 they are therefore obliged to factor in climate change. All applications are no susceptible to the same challenge.
- Moneystone and Whiston are surrounded by countryside. Both have few local services. Evidence establishes that neither have a regular or indeed any bus service. There are no footpaths along the route to the Hamlet and beyond to the A 52. It is self-evident that the narrow, twisting and undulating nature of these roads coupled to the damaged and badly deteriorating road surfaces makes travelling at or near 60 mph highly dangerous. The massive increase in traffic that is needed to make the proposed development sustainable the serious accident statistics seem certain to vastly increase.
- The SMDC are bound by the Paris Climate change Accord (PCCA) which came into law in 2016. Ignorance of the law is never an excuse. 2020 court appeal C1/2019/1154 [2020] did not change this law. The SMDC are under a duty to apply PCCA to all planning applications since November 2016. Applications SMD/2014/0682, SMD/2016/0378, SMD/2019/0725 and SMD/2019/0716 are therefore subject to this challenge. Therefore the applications previously granted permission should now be subject to determination of PCCP and should be void.
- Moneystone and Whiston are surrounded by countryside, with few local services and no regular bus service. Moneystone hamlet is linked to Eaves Lane via Blakeley Lane, with no footpaths along the route or beyond the A 52. Between the A 52 and Moneystone Quarry along Whiston Eaves Lane (WEL) there are virtually no footpaths. The 30MPH speed limit is often ignored. Beyond Whiston village hall the road is national speed, with a deteriorating road surface makes traveling at 60MPH dangerous. the massive increase in traffic that is needed to make the Moneystone Quarry development sustainable becomes a reality serious accident statistics seem certain to vastly increase. These road conditions on the only access route are unfavourable to permit walking and cycling alongside the road carriageways.
- Revised plans for SMD/2019/06464 revealed the extreme paucity of service facilities in the Hub area of the development. the Hub facilities seem very basic considering the potential numbers guests and day visitors. There are only 32 seats, the bar is extremely small. The changing rooms have only 2 showers with tiny changing rooms. The overall impression is that the development is intended as a retirement village. Visitors will be forced to leave the site for better facilities against the aims of SMDC CS Policy T1. As 40% of the lodges are intended to be sold for private ownership the retirement concept seems more likely.
- The Manual for Streets (MfS), referred to in expert traffic report by Paul Mew Associates does not include the suitability of the road conditions for walking or cycling, nor inclement weather.

- There are no street lights along WEL beyond the Village Hall until Eaves Lane enters Oakamoor.
- The applicant have not submitted any traffic evidence that complies with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act (Development and Management Procedure) (England) Order No. 595 2015.
- Appeal against refusal of planning permission by SMDC. The planning inspector when speaking of the development at Moneystone quarry ruled that 'This is not a case whereby under the NPPF the proposed development at Moneystone Quarry would support services in Whistone [and by extension Moneystone Hamlet, Oakamoor etc]. it will not enhance or maintain the vitality or rural communities with limited local services. Rather it will deprive those communities'
- The applications under consideration do not assess the issues of instability. The SMDC should consider Mineral planning guidance 5 – stability in surface mineral workings and tips reissued by National Government 05/05/2006. This guidance advises local authorities
- Criticism of the scoping report provided by the applicant is considered to be defective and deficient. A full EIA report that is fully informed of all the relevant information should be provided.
- Attention drawn to survival guide from international panel on climate change in relation to SMDC Core strategy on climate change.
- Heavy downpours/rain in 2023, attention drawn to the links of this rain fall to rise sea temperatures and the impacts of climate change on the UK.
- Critique on the June 2022 supplement arboriculture report my SMDC arboricultural officer for lack of clarity.
- 'it is impossible to understand how any of the above cited MQ applications can be determined by the SMDC LPA PAC in view of the findings and requirements of the Wardle Armstrong Peer Reviewed Moneystone Quarry (Stability) report of June 2022 which, it must be understood, was (only lately-04/05/2022-) Commissioned by SMDC LPA itself.'

Support (3)

- Positive for the area and welcome the investment
- Positive for employment opportunities and will add interest for local young people
- Traffic will not be a major problem as residents will not arrive and leave daily
- Economic benefits

Neither (13)

- The quarry has geological similarities to Berry Hill Sand Quarry, Mansfield, which recently collapsed
- Groundwater pollution risk
- Mountain biking will damage ancient woodland
- Loss of habitats
- Is the mass of accumulated water being considered with regards to instability?
- Insufficient information regarding location of pollutants and spoils
- Harm to heritage assets
- Have reports on stability since closure been considered?
- Apparently inconsistent decision making
- Poor clarity regarding documents on website
- Details of reprofiling and construction operations required to assess impact on land stability
- Insufficient information of status of reservoir – affects legal safety requirements
- Why have parish councils not been invited to be party to a PPA?
- Concerns regarding sewage discharge into River Churnet

Kingsley Parish Council

Councillors object to this as a matter of principle as it is related to SMD/2016/0378 which the PC objected to. The current application should be considered by Staffordshire County Council (SCC), the Mineral Authority, who granted the original permission for quarrying at the site subject to various conditions including a detailed Restoration Plan. The application for a change of use for the former Sibelco Laboratory building falls outside the red line boundary for the outline planning consent granted in 2016, (SMD/2016/0378), and as such should be referred to SCC. An historic stone barn at Little Eaves Farm has Listed Building status. The barn is in fairly close proximity to the Laboratory building. There is no consideration of or protection for the Listed Building with the planning application.

Cotton Parish Council

For a number of well-founded reasons fully outlined above, Cotton Parish Council object to planning application SMD/2019/0646 considering the Phase 1 development as a whole. Councillors and local residents object to this related planning application for these reasons

Sustainability:

The site is a rural location in the mid Churnet Valley. The size of the proposed development is considerably larger than Cotton Parish. The 2014 Highways Report supporting SMD/2016/0378 is now out of date due to ever increasing levels of traffic generally and the change of vehicle use generated by increased lodge ownership.

Transport – Road Safety:

It is widely accepted that the bulk of traffic accessing or leaving the site will do so through narrowing lanes of the neighbouring parishes. The number of permanent residents potentially living on the site may well exasperate this situation further. a) The immediate road system in the area is a cause for concern. b) SMDC planners have recently refused planning applications for developments near this location because of road safety risks.

Recycled Materials:

There are concerns about the nature and quantity of the recycled building materials which will be brought to the site.

Environment – Climate Change:

SMDC have declared a climate change emergency. It proposed that the Staffordshire Moorlands should become carbon neutral by 2030. There is no public transport to this site. All access to the site will be by private vehicles. The large volume of traffic potentially accessing the site will have a significant negative effect on pollution levels, likely to be dramatically higher than at present.

AONB:

In 2013 Churnet Valley Conservation Society (CVCS) made an application to Natural England for the Churnet Valley to be considered for Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) status. The application was supported by SMDC and by Karen Bradley (MP) who has recently reaffirmed her support to stop this development. The application was considered by DEFRA during their 2018 Landscape Review. At present the Churnet Valley has been short listed and is one of three sites being considered for AONB status. It is believed that the Moneystone Quarry development will have a negative impact on the application.

Community Impact:

The sheer size and scale of the development would have a negative impact on the local villages. Many of the proposed lodges may be sold to purchasers who live there on a permanent basis. This is in effect a planning application for a new community which at

present does not exist. Such planning proposals would be refused in any other part of Staffordshire Moorlands.

Oakamoor Parish Council

Object to the application for the following reasons:

1. The application for change of use for the laboratory building falls outside of the red line boundary for the Outline Planning Consent granted in 2016 (SMD/2016/0378), and therefore should be referred to The Minerals Planning Authority: Staffordshire County Council, who granted permission for quarrying at Moneystone. It should be noted that this was subject to many conditions including a Restoration Plan, revised March 2014 (much of which has not been met) **.

2. We note that the application was submitted on the 26th November 2019. It therefore cannot rely on any aspects of the outline permission (LPA ref: SMD/2016/0378) to be used in its support as the deadline for bringing forward any reserved matters, expired on 26th October 2019.

Other issues:

- There is no relevant Traffic Impact and Access statement (The laboratories have not been used for at least two years, and therefore generate no traffic). This is especially relevant to Oakamoor in view of the refusal of SMD/2016/0388. We are particularly concerned that the Supporting Transport note claims:

(4.2.1) In conclusion, the proposed redevelopment is considered to provide a net benefit with regards to reduction of potential vehicle trips to the site and promotion of sustainable transport."

By changing the use of the what is a redundant building to which attracts no traffic, to one which provides facilities that will attract more visitors to the site, cannot be seen as a reduction of potential trips and a promotion of sustainable transport!

There is no provision within the Design and Access statement that relates to the impact of the construction and building work upon the adjacent environment.

There are no references to the light, noise and air pollution that would be expected to arise from the change of use.

There is no impact assessment regarding ancient woodland which lies adjacent to the site.

**The plan required, within 2 months of the approval, a Landscape - Ecological - Management Report covering the whole quarry area, describing actions and progress during the previous 12 months and planned actions for the next 12 months. Reporting was then required to continue throughout the 5 year aftercare period.) It is our understanding that full restoration is still not complete, and neither have the applicants met the requirements for the annual landscape - ecological management reporting during the 5 year after-care period.

Policy Officer

The current site also falls within the Churnet Valley. The building is described as containing laboratories/offices/warehousing associated with the previous quarrying activity. A view needs to be reached whether the building's floor space is comprised of B uses, or possibly sui generis use if connected with the quarry (refer to 1987 UCO as amended which may exclude certain activities around quarries from industrial definition). If you are minded that the floorspace does fall within B use then a view needs to be reached whether the premises qualifies for protection under CS E2 (first 3 bullets). For example the building is situated over 470m from Eaves Lane (about 1.8km from A52, about 2.5km from B5417) and there do not

appear to be any bus routes along Eaves Lane. Note that emerging Policy E3 defines employment premises more widely – not just B uses. Would the existing and proposed uses qualify as ‘employment’ (ie is there an overall employment loss?). In the event of employment loss of sites worthy of protection, both existing Policy E2 emerging E3 expect commercial (marketing) demonstration or demonstration of substantial planning benefits (and then, retention of as much B use as possible on site). Illustrative plans show how the converted building would lie only a short distance from adjacent uses (hub etc) as proposed under adjacent REM application, functioning as a single development. Policy R1 and other policies support re-use of buildings over greenfield development. If you deem the principle of conversion acceptable it also needs to be considered whether the structure is appropriate for its new uses (Policy R1 etc). Also note the scheme involves slight extensions to the building– refer to design, landscape, sustainable development policies etc in both the adopted and emerging Local Plan. I note that the outline consent established maximum floorspace limits for all approved uses (including those considered in this application) – the particulars demonstrate that the proposals fall within the thresholds. (In the context of the adjacent REM application) would approval need to specify through conditions that these thresholds could not be breached in the event of both schemes being approved?

Operations Manager -Waste

Advises that there are no issues with this application

Environmental Health Officer

No objection subject to conditions

Local Highway Authority

There are no objections on Highway grounds to the proposed development subject to the following conditions being included on any approval. As the existing laboratory building are now intended to accommodate part of the permitted outline uses, this proposal should represent a reduction in trips that the site could generate. The proposed development will be using the exiting access onto the highway network.

Recommended Condition:-

The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the access, parking, servicing and

turning areas have been provided in accordance with drawing 1733-LB-019

Reasons:- To comply with the Policies contained within the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan 2014 In the interest of Highway Safety.

Conservation Officer

No objection subject to planting scheme to filter views from Little Eaves Farm.

Advises that the 2016 ES visual assessment (Viewpoint 17 photomontage & wireline) is particularly helpful to the assessment of this application.

A Heritage Technical Note has been produced (based on the 2016 visual assessment) to describe any potential heritage impacts. It concludes that there are no additional impacts.

Feels that it would be preferable to have several smaller buildings with the same design/materials treatment rather than one extremely large hub building to allow development to be more effectively assimilated into the landscape. Would agree that the works associated with the converted lab building would not worsen the visual impact to the setting of Little Eaves Farm than that which has already been identified as part of the wider development scheme. Notes that the lab buildings can be seen from the environs around Little Eaves Farm so would request planting to filter these views.

County Archaeologist

No objection. Having reviewed the proposals in light of the information held by the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record (and associated datasets) and the Heritage Technical Note submitted in support of the application, raises no archaeological concerns with the proposals

Trees and Woodland Officer

The existing buildings, their retention, change of use, minor extensions, and alterations to external appearance – together with retention of existing car park areas – would all be viewed in the context of the approved leisure park development. The current application site is surrounded on three sides by the wider leisure park site and existing solar panel arrays, and on the fourth by existing mature woodland, and is/would remain a relatively well-screened part of the overall scheme as viewed from external viewpoints due to a combination of topography and existing vegetation. Such screening would be increased further by implementation and establishment of the comprehensive new landscaping scheme already proposed as part of the main site development.

This application would re-use an existing building essentially for a range of uses which were already part of the 2016 outline proposals, and such uses (especially within or based from a pre-existing building) would not themselves raise any new significant landscape or visual effects. Minor physical alterations only are proposed to the former laboratory building, and it is situated well beyond (c.60m) the closest part of the Key Wood Ancient Woodland site, comfortably exceeding the minimum 15m buffer recommended in Natural England Standing Advice. Similarly, changes to parking/servicing would be local to the existing yard area immediately around the building and again would not have adverse impact on the Ancient Woodland.

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust

No objection subject to conditions

Local Lead Flood Authority

No objection. Advise that the proposals are small in scale with no increase in impermeable area and no significant change to the footprint of the building, the flood risk associated with the existing site is considered low and will not significantly increase as a result of the re-development. .

Mineral Authority (Staffordshire CC) .No objection

Severn Trent Water

No objection subject to drainage condition

Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Staffordshire Police have no objection to the proposals. Comment that it is worth noting that the building will be somewhat detached from the rest of the site and probably subject to little in the way of natural surveillance, certainly at quieter times. Unrestricted vehicle access to it would be possible via the main site entrance (unless there are some controls to be put in place) and it would be approachable via the access track from the valley. The cycle store and plant rooms are the elements of the building that one might imagine could attract unwanted attention. These are also more hidden, on the elevations of the building facing away from the main site. The applicant should take appropriate steps both in terms of physical and technological security to mitigate any perceived security risks.

Ramblers Association

Object. This application will create a huge increase in air pollution due to the large increase in motor cars coming into the Churnet Valley and in doing so be in direct conflict with the

resolution passed by the SMDC some months ago which recognised the urgent need to curb green house gasses.

If the PAC pass this development, it will give the green light to other developers who wish to exploit the beauty of the area for commercial gain and would be remembered by the local residents and tourists to the area for years to come. The Ramblers are most concerned that the existing Footpaths in the Moneystone area will be overrun by thrill seekers and not genuine tourists who would wish to spend their money within local area and towns. It has already been acknowledged that visitors to the Leisure Park which is akin to a Centre Parc will only spend money within the Park so there will be no financial benefit to the local community or the Moorlands in general. The area has a very low unemployment figure so the so-called jobs that will be created will be using low wage earners who will have to be bussed into the area creating even more pollution.

Churnet Valley Conservation Society

This a full application that is outside the red line development boundary and has to be viewed as a standalone application on its merits.

As such it cannot use any reference to or seek support from the outline permission ie be piggy backed by the outline permission for the leisure development, on the same grounds or precedent, as in the judgement by HR Piling in the judicial review case involving SMD/2016 /0378 and SMD/2016/0388 in 2017.

As it is beyond the redline it is a county matter and should be referred to SCC for a decision. To do otherwise would be ultra vires on the part of SMDC.

In 2017 SMDC passed a resolution that at the reserved matters stage, the detailed scheme(s) for the hub development

b) Shall not exceed the land use parameter for the location of the hub buildings in accordance with the revised parameter plan drawing ref PL1088.M.110 rev6)

The land /building cannot therefore be used for a hub.

NB That 2017 resolution by SMDC also included a provision for additional landscaping within the hub area which further screens the Hub development from the listed buildings at Little Eaves farm and the surrounding footpaths etc. which is not included on the Conservation officer's report so will be a further objection.

The forestry commission has not been consulted on this application or on SMD/2019/0646 but recent information obtained by CVCS from the definitive map indicates that this application is within 15 metres of a ribbon of ancient woodland, the impact upon which has not been accounted for in the application documents.

When Laver bought the site, it inherited the liabilities for the quarry permission ref SM.94/852 which requires all buildings thereby permitted to be demolished within 6 months of cessation of quarrying. This extant building is therefore in breach of Condition 5 of that permission and should be demolished.

It is currently subject to enforcement notices served by SCC and this action again indicates that it is a County matter and should be dealt with by them.

The 2014 agreed restoration plan did not indicate the retention of the building by Laver as falsely claimed by Laver's agents in their application. It is indicated as owned by Sibelco. Laver were requested by SCC in 2014 at the time of the restoration agreement to formalise

the use of any extant buildings that should have been demolished but never applied for permission.

All buildings including the maintenance building and offices in application SMD/2019/0646 are likewise to be demolished as a result of their non-compliance with the site permission.

They too are the subject of enforcement orders requiring removal.

The proposed design for the hub facilities is not luxurious or spacious as was promised when initially proposed. It is a utilitarian block seen in quarries all over the Peak District with small rooms being used for a secondary option as the hub building has failed to accommodate all the requirements needed.

Sustainability:

By changing the use of what is a redundant building which attracts no traffic, to one which provides facilities that will attract more visitors to the site, cannot be seen as a reduction of potential trips and a promotion of sustainable transport as claimed in the support documents as this is contrary to the Policy T1

The impact of external modern materials needed to change the building has not been properly assessed upon the setting of the nearby listed buildings at Eaves Farm or the impact of noise and light from the activities proposed in its reuse.

There are several errors and omissions on the documentary submissions which have been notified to SMDC but remain on their file website.

This is unacceptable as they are making false claims on a form that is, *stricto sensu*, a legal document and must be error free for validation. For example, on the application form Q8 it says there is no new or altered vehicular access proposed to or from the public highway, but the permitted access it claims is the one that requires the no right turn alterations and plans that have to be approved under the outline permission.

Likewise new public rights of way are to be provided adjacent to the site but this too is denied on the form.

Item 10 is incorrect as there are ancient woodland and hedges adjacent and within 15 metres of the site.

On item 11 there is a watercourse within 30 metres of the site (stream D) Item 19 Hours of opening are relevant to the application but there are no details.

Item 20 not completed yet there will be machinery involved for activities and processes carried out. The transport statement is also wrong where it says in 2.3.4 *There is no proposed change to the site access from existing conditions. Vehicular and pedestrian access is proposed to be provided from the north of the site, from the overall Moneystone Park leisure development site.*

It conveniently or erroneously ignores the alterations to the access that have to be carried out according to the outline permission.

No pond surveys have been undertaken for the two ponds behind the premises since 2016 and the likelihood of crested newts being present has to be checked.

It is also claimed that there have been no physical changes to the overall site ie the quarry site, but in 2021 unlawful excavations took place without LPA permission destroying the safety overflow system inter alia.

When you add up all these known false statements, it is unacceptable for the LPA to proceed further without correction of the document as it negates the whole purpose of the form and its accuracy. The information has to be correct otherwise you are not considering the planning balance properly.

As it stands, this application is invalid.

7 OFFICER COMMENT AND PLANNING BALANCE

8.1 Notwithstanding the fact that the building, focus of this application is subject to an Enforcement Notice that requires its demolition, there is nothing in planning law or policy which prevents the applicant from seeking planning permission to retain the building and put it to another use (i.e. non quarry related) This application must be determined, as with all applications, in accordance with the Development plan, unless there are material circumstances which indicate otherwise

8.2 The building in question is of substantial construction. It was previously in employment use and as such Policy E3 of the Local Plan is relevant and the starting point in the consideration of the application. Policy E3 refers to existing employment land/building and seeks to protect such sites where they are well related to the road and public transport network, where they will support the local economy and where they can provide good quality modern accommodation attractive to the market without harm to nearby residents. The Policy sets out several exceptions where loss of an employment site may be permitted. Of relevance to this application is bullet point A. It refers to situations where the site is identified in the Local Plan for development of non-employment uses.

8.3. Applying Policy E3, the application site is not well located to the main road or public transport network nor is it within a location where employment uses are actively promoted. Although the proposal could not be said to be an employment use in terms of the policy, the application form indicates that up to 15 FTE staff will be employed. Furthermore, the site lies within the Churnet Valley. Policy SS11 provides the strategy for the Churnet Valley and says that it is an area identified for sustainable tourism and rural regeneration. It goes on to say that development here should be in accordance with the adopted Churnet Valley Masterplan. The site lies within the Moneystone Character Area of the Masterplan key actions for which include the creation of a high quality new tourism and leisure destination at Moneystone quarry in line with the Concept Statement. In this respect the Local Plan (Policy SS11) does identify the site for other non-employment uses, namely sustainable tourism to benefit the local economy. Provided therefore that the proposal is not a standalone development but is linked to the approved leisure development at Moneystone quarry, then the principle is in accordance with Policy E3 and E11. There is another matter to also consider and that is that half of the proposed floorspace relates to uses already consented under the approved leisure scheme (SMD/2016/0378). By retaining and re-using this building, a smaller hub building is required. The Conservation Officer for one considers this to be a preferable option – see discussion below.

8.4 It is for these reasons that no conflict with Policy E3 is found and the principle of development is acceptable in terms of Policy SS11 provided its link to the adjacent leisure scheme is secured by condition. The other main issues to consider are access, design, ecology, landscaping and these are considered under the subheadings below.

Access

8.5 The application is supported by a Transport Note (Stantec October 2019). Access is to be via the re-routed access proposed under SMD/2019/0646 which links to the existing quarry access onto Whiston Eaves Lane. Parking is provided adjacent to the building using the existing car park. The Local Highway Authority has considered the application and raises no objection. There is no evidence/reason to take a different line and subject therefore to a condition requiring the parking, servicing and turning areas to be provided before the building is brought into first use and a condition to prevent no right turns out of the site, to align with Condition 23 of SMD/2016/0378 no highway issue is raised and there is compliance with the relevant part of Policies DC1 and T1 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Design

8.6 The proposal largely works with the existing building. Some existing windows and doors are removed where internal uses necessitate, and three small extensions are proposed as described above. No objection is raised to these. One relates to the provision of a feature entrance and lobby created from an existing roller shutter door opening on the northwest elevation. This becomes the main entrance and focal point to the building, and it is considered to link well with the main hub building of the adjacent leisure scheme. Existing ducts and flues are removed and the whole building re clad in a mix of timber cladding and black profile sheeting with dark grey aluminium window frames and doors. The DAS explains that the design rationale is to change the appearance from 'industrial' to 'agricultural'. Although an 'agricultural' appearance is not necessarily considered to be the outcome of the proposed changes, the proposed alterations and materials are considered to be acceptable and as the DAS says will visually tie in with the materials proposed for buildings in the reserved matters application for the adjacent leisure scheme. Subject therefore to a condition to secure an appropriate colour for the metal sheeting and samples of materials, the design is acceptable and there is compliance with Policy DC1 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Biodiversity

8.7 The application is supported by a Bay survey (Bowland Ecology; Ecological Advice Note : Sibelco Laboratory, Moneystone Quarry dated 30/3/2020) and response from Bowland Ecology dated 15th July 2020

8.8 The application has been reviewed by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (SWT) on behalf of the Council. They are satisfied that the proposals will not impact habitats adjacent to the application site. They say that a detailed drainage scheme design will be required via condition. The expectation is that this should use sustainable drainage for surface water, such as porous materials where possible, and infiltration to landscaped areas such as tree pits, swales or rain gardens within new landscaping.

8.9 In terms of securing a biodiversity net gain SWT advise that this could simply be achieved by enhancing remaining grassland on the site via scrub control, additional seeding and creation of bare ground features and log piles for invertebrates and reptiles. Gains within the development area could include creating a 'rain garden' as part of landscaping/ surface drainage; planting of trees within the car park (also for shade) and including a green wall on the building using climbers, which would also provide visual benefits. Species enhancements should also be included, for birds and bats, such as nest and roost boxes on the building.

8.10 In terms of protected species, SWT advise that the additional information supplied has addressed information on species impacts. They say that due to the presence of reptiles, amphibians and badgers in the wider area adequate measures should be taken during construction to protect these species and this can be secured via a simple method statement. Similarly protection measures for bats and birds should be secured via condition.

8.11 With conditions in place therefore to secure the following, the application is acceptable in terms of biodiversity and there is compliance with Policy NE1 and the NPPF

- a landscaping scheme and BNG metric,
- method statements for the protection of amphibians, reptiles and badgers,
- species protection measures for bats and birds as set out in Ecological Advice Note Bat Survey by Bowland Ecology Ltd dated 30/03/2020
- drainage details using SUDS principles for surface water,
- long term management and monitoring plan

Heritage

8.12 The application is supported by a Heritage Technical Note and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Technical Note (April 2020) This confirms that the site formed part of the archaeological desk-based assessment in the 2016 Environmental Statement which supported SMD/2016/0378 (see history) and that Little Eaves farmhouse and barn (Grade II Listed) formed part of the heritage assessment of the same ES.

8.13 The conclusion of the submitted documents is that there are no changes to the landscape or visual effects predicted in the 2016 ES as a result of this proposal. Furthermore there are not anticipated to be any additional effects on heritage or archaeology as a result of the proposal and that no heritage mitigation is required but that a watching brief/walk over survey would provide sufficient mitigation to deal with any as yet to be discovered remains.

8.14 The Conservation Officer has considered the application. She agrees that the works associated with the proposal would not worsen the visual impact to the setting of Little Eaves Farm than that which has already been identified as part of the wider development scheme. She does comment however that the application building can be seen from the environs around Little Eaves Farm and because of this requests that planting is secured to filter these views. This can be conditioned. Commenting generally, she considers that it would be preferable to have several smaller buildings with the same design/materials treatment as now proposed rather than one extremely large hub building to allow development to be more effectively assimilated into the landscape.

8.15 The County Archaeologist also accepts the conclusions of the Heritage Technical Note. He has no archaeological concerns with the application (see above).

8.16 Overall, subject to conditions, no material heritage harm is identified. A condition to secure some additional planting is recommended to filter views from Little Eaves farm. With this in place there is compliance with Policy DC2 of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

Trees and Landscape/Visual impact

8.17 No trees are affected by the proposal which relates to use of an existing building (albeit one which is currently required to be demolished). The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Technical Note (April 2020) assesses likely landscape and visual impact and its conclusion that this will be minimal is accepted.

Although retaining this building and the small extensions proposed will have some landscape impact its overall scale and form is such that this will be limited and not considered to be problematic. In terms of appearance, the proposed façade treatment is appropriate and so too is the use of natural timber and generally muted tones. The building is situated well beyond (c60m) the closest part of the Key Wood Ancient Woodland site, comfortably exceeding the 15m buffer recommended in Natural England Standing Advice. Subject to securing a landscaping scheme by condition to soften the proposal and assimilate into the landscape, no issue is raised in respect of tree protection or landscape and visual impact and there is compliance with relevant parts of Policies NE2, DC3 and the NPPF

Other Issues

8.18 The Environmental Health Officer has considered the application and recommends a number of conditions to minimise noise during and post construction and to deal with any unexpected contamination. In respect of air quality and in order to discourage high emission vehicle use and encourage take up of low emission fuels and technologies in accordance with policy, he considers that some electric vehicle charging points should be secured by condition to give potential users and employees the opportunity to use low emission electric vehicles to offset the slight increase in emissions occasioned by the proposal. With relevant conditions in place there is compliance with Policy SD4 and the NPPF

8.19 There is reference on the application form to the provision of a package treatment plant on site but no details are provided. This can be conditioned. The Environment Agency were consulted on the application but had not responded at the time of preparing this report.

Planning Balance

8.20 At the time Staffordshire County Council granted Planning permission (reference SM.94/852) for the erection of new buildings, including the application building on 12 December 1994 and imposed Condition 5 (which requires the removal of such buildings within 6 months of the cessation of the wining and working of minerals at Moneystone Quarry), the after use of the site for a leisure scheme was not envisaged. Clearly the subsequent adoption by this Council in 2012 of the Churnet Valley Masterplan and the endorsement therein of a tourism and leisure destination at Moneystone Quarry and the subsequent grant of planning permission in 2016 for a leisure development at the site has materially changed the position at the site. Once the leisure development is implemented, the application building will not form part of a restored quarry but will sit within a leisure development. Its retention and re use as part of this is, for the reasons set out above considered to be acceptable.

The proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan. There are no material considerations which indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the Development plan.

A recommendation of approval is therefore made.

8 RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions: -

1.The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:- To comply with Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended)

2.The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

1733 MS 002	Location plan
1733 LB 004	Existing floor plan
1733 LB 005	Existing elevations
1733 LB 009	Existing Site plan
1733 LB 010	Proposed Floor plan
1733 LB 019 Rev B	Proposed site plan
1733 LB 014 Rev 1	Proposed elevations

Reason:- For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The development hereby permitted shall only be used and operated as a facility of the adjacent leisure scheme permitted under SMD/2016/0378 and shall not at any time be sold, let or used as an independent standalone facility.

Reason:- In the interests of highway safety and the integrity of the Approved Restoration Plan for the site.

4. No external works to the building shall take place until such time that samples of all facing and roofing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall subsequently be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details

Reason:- To ensure an acceptable external finish and in the interests of the character and appearance of the area

Electric vehicles charging points

5. The use hereby permitted shall not commence until such time that electric vehicle charging (EVC) points are installed and operational in accordance with a scheme which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The Scheme shall be based on 1 EVC point for every 6 spaces provided and it shall include appropriate cable provision to prepare for increased demand in future years

Reason: - To promote the use of low emission vehicles and mitigate the impact of any additional vehicles on local air pollution

Construction and Environmental Management plan

6. No development hereby permitted shall take place until a Construction and Environmental Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include the following details:-

- i. the hours of work, which shall not exceed the following: Construction and associated deliveries to the site shall not take place outside 08:00 to 18:00 hours Mondays to Fridays, and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holiday;
- ii. the arrangements for prior notification to the occupiers of potentially affected properties;
- iii. the responsible person (e.g. site manager / office) who could be contacted in the event of complaint;
- iv. a scheme to minimise dust emissions arising from construction activities on the site. The scheme shall include details of all dust suppression measures and the methods to monitor emissions of dust arising from the development. The approved dust suppression measures shall be maintained in a fully functional condition for the duration of the construction phase;
- v. a scheme for recycling/disposal of waste resulting from the construction works;
- vi. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- vii. the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- viii. the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- ix. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- x. details of measures to protect the public footpaths and amenity of users of the public footpaths crossing the site during the construction works.

All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.

Unexpected Contamination

7. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. If after consultation with the Local Planning Authority the contamination is considered to pose a possible risk, to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment (receptors), development should not commence further until a site investigation and risk assessment has been completed in accordance with a scheme to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority. If the contamination investigation and risk assessment indicates that potential risks exist to receptors, development shall not commence until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to the receptors has been prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development meets the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in that all potential risks to human health, controlled waters and wider environment are known and where necessary dealt with via remediation and or management of those risks.

Waste Management

8. Any waste material associated with the demolition or construction shall not be burnt on site but shall be kept securely for removal to prevent escape into the environment.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the area.

Noise and Sound Insulation

9. A scheme for the containment of operational related noise for the development hereby approved which is designed for entertainment and leisure purposes shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the building. The approved scheme(s) shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the building.

Reason: To protect the nearby properties from noise.

10. There shall be no means for the amplification of sound (music, voice, soundtrack) installed to the exterior of any buildings hereby approved with the exception of fire and security alarms.

Reason: To protect occupiers from noise and safeguard their residential amenities.

11. No plant or machinery shall be installed within any part of the development hereby approved until a scheme specifying the make, model and position of the plant or machinery has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of the predicted sound levels that will result from the plant or machinery at noise sensitive locations. The methodology of such assessment including the noise sensitive locations shall be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason:- To ensure that the reasonable residential amenities of adjoining properties are adequately protected from noise pollution

Lighting

12. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until full details of the proposed external lighting scheme has been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall be broadly in accordance with guidance set out in the Institute of Lighting Engineers (Reduction of Light Pollution)(2011) or prevailing guidance and be accompanied by evidence that it is approved by a qualified ecologist in relation to its impact on bats. There shall be no external lighting other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:- In the interests of residential amenity, the character and appearance of the Area, nearby Listed buildings and protected species

Highways

13. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the access, parking, servicing and turning areas have been provided in accordance with drawing 1733-LB-019

Reason:- To comply with the Policies contained within the Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan policies DC1 and T1 and in the interest of highway safety.

No right turn

14. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until such time that details (including signage and road markings) of the works to realign the main site access on Eaves Lane, so as to prohibit vehicles from turning right out of the site into Carr Bank Lane have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The highways works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development.

Reason:- In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the development aligns with the approved access arrangements under with SMD/2016/0378

Landscaping

15. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, no development shall commence until such time that a fully detailed landscaping and planting scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be accompanied by a BNG metric (4.0) to demonstrate that a net gain in biodiversity of at least 10% is achieved.

The approved landscape and planting scheme shall thereafter be implemented within the first available planting season following the development being brought into use.

Any tree, hedge or shrub planted as part of the approved landscape and planting scheme (or replacement tree/hedge) on the site, which dies or is lost through any cause during a period of 5 years from the date of first planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.

Reason:- In the interest of the character and appearance of the area, the setting of nearby Listed buildings and to secure a net gain in biodiversity

Biodiversity

16. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until such time that a long term Maintenance and Monitoring plan (MMP) for existing and newly created habitats on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved MMP

Reason:- To ensure a biodiversity net gain and biodiversity enhancement

17. The development hereby approved shall be carried in strict accordance with the species protection measures for bats and birds set out in Bowland Ecology; Ecological Advice Note : Sibelco Laboratory, Moneystone Quarry dated 30/3/2020

Reason:- In the interests of protected species

18. No development shall commence until such time that Method Statements for the protection of amphibians, reptiles and badgers has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details

Reason:- In the interests of protected species

Drainage

19. No development shall commence until full details for the disposal of foul and surface water have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Surface water drainage should be based on SUDS principles. Details should include arrangements for future maintenance and management of both the foul and surface water

systems. The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details

Reason:- In the interests of securing an acceptable drainage system and biodiversity enhancement

Informative

1.A sustainable development has been negotiated which accords with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework

- B. In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/in formatives/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,**

