

**STAFFORDSHIRE MOORLANDS DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE**

**12<sup>th</sup> November 2024**

<b>Application No:</b>	SMD/2024/0077	
<b>Location</b>	Basford Hall, Basford Green, Cheddleton	
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of Agricultural and Woodchip Storage Building	
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr. W Scott-Moncrief	
<b>Agent</b>	Mr Rob Duncan, Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy Ltd	
<b>Parish/ward</b>	Cheddleton / Cheddleton	<b>Date registered</b> 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2024
<b>If you have a question about this report please contact:</b> Arne Swithenbank tel: 01538 395578 or e-mail <a href="mailto:arne.swithenbank@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk">arne.swithenbank@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk</a>		

## **REFERRAL**

The application is a Full – Minor and is referred to Committee by the Head of Development Services as it is considered to be locally contentious noting the objections to this proposal from the Parish Council and neighbouring residents.

### **1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

**Approve with conditions**

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

- 2.1 The site occupies a field location to one side of a bluff of land overlooking the Churnet Valley in the direction of Cheddleton. It would be reached across the open field to the west of the main entrance drive to Basford Hall. The Hall is Grade II Listed and some 250m further to the south of the application site.
- 2.2 The field access point to the site is reached from the end of the adopted but unclassified Basford Hall Road which runs through the hamlet of Basford Green for a short distance of 170m from Basford Green Road.
- 2.3 Some 8 to 12 dwellings make up the hamlet. Closest to the site are Lodge Cottage and Lodge Farm within some 120m to 130m of the site. These are part of the Basford Hall Estate and are understood currently to be operated as five holiday lets. They are both Grade II Listed. Un-associated with the development is Sneyd Arms Farm a dwelling within 200m to the north east and also Grade II Listed. Breeze House and Fairholme are again un-associated dwellings and lie within some 150m to the north north-east.

- 2.4 The Council's Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment places the site location in the 'dissected sandstone cloughs and valleys' Landscape Character Type (LCT) and an area which here is classified as being of high landscape quality (level 4 in the County-wide context).
- 2.5 The site is within an area which the Staffordshire Heritage Environment inventory records as landscaped parkland to Basford Hall.
- 2.6 There are thick high hedges to the northern and eastern edges of the site co-inciding with the edge of the estate ownership. On neighbouring land immediately adjacent to the east is a 9m x 18m farm shed of height 3.8m to the eaves and 4.6m to the ridge approved and built under SMD/2020/0178.

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

- 3.1 The proposal building would be c. 24.4m x 18.3m with 6.0m eaves height and 8.8m ridge height. Gross internal floor space is given as 445m<sup>2</sup>. External materials would comprise exposed concrete panels to the lower c.2.8m; dark green vertical metal cladding to upper elevations and roof in fibre cement sheeting.
- 3.2 As first submitted the access across the field to the site was annotated on the plans as 'existing' track. A revised plan was later provided to acknowledge there is no existing track present. This now shows a proposed 'new hardcore track'. Also shown is an area of holly, pine and yew planting to screen the development.
- 3.3 Some explanation of the intended purpose of the development is given in additional supporting information submitted including a list of machinery. Purposes of security, weather protection, organisation and ability to carry out indoor maintenance are cited.
- 3.4 Secondly, the estate operates two wood-chip fuelled biomass boilers "that provide renewable heat to all the properties on the estate." They say: the storage is needed in order to stockpile larger quantities of woodchip and maintain the ideal moisture content. To burn efficiently, woodchip must be kept at a moisture content below 25%. Proper ventilation will be included to reduce humidity allowing the woodchip to have a good airflow through it. Without proper dry storage, the woodchip absorbs moisture and does not burn as cleanly or efficiently in the boilers. The development is intended to ensure a steady supply of dry fuel for the boilers can be maintained.
- 3.5 The submissions say that the Estate owns and manages over 300 acres of commercial woodland – chiefly an area of semi-natural ancient woodland known as Consall Woods. A significant volume of wood chip can be produced just by good management of woodland. Well-maintained woodland involves the thinning of trees and using the felled excess timber effectively is part of the rationale, displacing previous reliance on heating

oil. There is acknowledgement that in certain years the supply from the woodland may not meet the requirements of the boilers. Woodchip is then bought-in and this is the current system.

- 3.6 With regard to noise they say the cut wood will be stacked and later chipped in the woodland, the majority of the time, and therefore will create no noise at the storage shed.
- 3.7 With regard to fire risk the submissions acknowledge that freshly cut woodchip can initially have a moisture content of over 100% and when stock-piled is very susceptible to spontaneous combustion. However, this wood is not chipped straight away. It is stacked to dry for over a year until moisture content has been recorded under 25%. They say that when woodchip is dried to around 25% moisture content, decomposing or combusting is extremely unlikely. Woodchips dried to this 25% threshold are safe for long-term stockpiling and have a low risk of causing fires through spontaneous combustion.

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

- 4.1 There is no planning history to the ground plan area of the proposal building. There is an extended planning history for the Basford Hall Estate and various buildings within it.
- 4.2 SMD/2013/0731 was for Erection of Replacement Barn for Mixed Use of Agriculture and Biomass Energy Generation Unit – approved. This is in a position close to the rear of the hall itself.
- 4.3 SMD/2017/0145 was a retrospective application for the retention of a biomass building in a position east of Lodge Cottage – approved.
- 4.4 SMD/2023/0307 was for a “proposed new compacted hardcore service track to existing Biomass Boiler across existing private agricultural land (part retrospective)” – refused

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

- 5.1 **Local Plan (adopted 9<sup>th</sup> September 2020)**
- SS1 Development Principles
  - SS2 Settlement Hierarchy
  - SS10 Rural Areas Area Strategy
  - SD1 Sustainable use of resources
  - SD3 Sustainability measures in development
  - DC1 Design Considerations
  - DC2 The Historic Environment
  - DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
  - NE1 Biodiversity and Geological Resources
  - NE2 Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

### **National Planning Policy Framework December 2023**

Paragraph(s) 1 – 14;

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

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

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

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

- Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment (2008)

## **6. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT**

Site Notice expiry date: 27<sup>th</sup> Jun 2024

Neighbour consultation period ended: 1<sup>st</sup> April 2024

Press Advert expiry: N/A

### **Public comments**

6.1

The following concerns are raised:

- Query no consultation with fire service
- Query statement: no trees or hedges on the site
- Unauthorised felling has led to a Forestry Commission restocking order
- The 10-year woodland plan is linked to the above
- Query whether felling from 2000 to 2024 was granted felling licences
- The proposed siting is detrimental to the historic parkland landscape
- The siting should be set away from the array of Grade II Listed buildings
- Adversely affects the Basford Green hamlet's character
- Query requirement as chipping previously done elsewhere
- Ancient trees are being extracted for this biomass chipping enterprise
- Will impose haulage traffic on the hamlet
- The applicant already has space and facility for this activity which has been accommodated outdoors on the site of former large agricultural building and yard with existing track access
- That area is not situated at the perimeter of the applicant's ground in the direct view of neighbours
- Proposal site only has cross-field access with no laid track
- new track construction will have to take place on what is currently a green field site
- In the refused retrospective application SMD/2023/0307 for a track/road for said biomass woodchip enterprise a total requirement for 200 tons/year of woodchip was stated. This proposed agricultural shed application is for a

very large shed situated in mainly open countryside, nearly some 9m tall and with some 445m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace. Yet it is stated in the application as requiring to hold just a mere 20 tons of biomass storage, and some agricultural equipment.

- The applicant does not have an agricultural business, instead renting the grounds out locally to farmers.
- Noise impacts for neighbours from the wood-chipping process
- No doubt if approved work would start with the large amount of uncut timber already amassed at the site
- An alien sized over-large building in this location
- unsuitable position in the Basford Hall historical parkland landscape
- The shed will be visually intrusive for neighbours and in clear view of listed buildings, and it will undoubtedly be utilised for industrial-scale operations
  
- Insufficient information submitted as part of the planning application relating to its proposed use
- Impact on the landscape and heritage setting, and impacts on neighbouring land uses
- Incorrectly completed Application Forms
- Lack of suitable access proposals.
- Insufficient supporting information and evidence including ecological and tree/hedgerow surveys
- Impact on the landscape, its character and development on a currently greenfield part of the estate without utilising existing brownfield land on the estate, which is already well served by existing access roads
- Impact on heritage assets, namely in the form of impacting on the historic parkland setting and listed buildings
- Ecological impacts arising from the scheme itself and the broader implications in respect of encouraging further tree felling on the estate
- With a number of ponds adjacent there are Great Crested Newts, which have not been considered as part of this application.
- Amenity impacts on neighbouring uses which will be further increased depending on the ultimate end use of the proposed building.
- Whether the building should actually be B2 use classification rather than 'agricultural building'
- The proposed building will set a threshold precedent and establish a new foothold for further staged development / buildings on a current greenfield part of the parkland landscape.
- Appropriate ecological surveys should have been undertaken and submitted in support of the application.
- The Council will need to ensure that, if the scheme is approved, conditions restricting the use of the building to storage only should be included and enforced.
- Site is part of a historic country estate where there are mature parkland trees and woodland areas of great importance to the landscape character and potentially of significant biodiversity value. Concern has previously been raised around the felling of the trees on the estate, which impact on its character and existing biodiversity.
- From the planning history LPA officers have previously highlighted that 14 properties on the estate are served by the two biomass boilers and during

winter there are two deliveries per week with an 8-tonne lorry transporting 200 tonnes of woodchip.

- The proposed new building is located at a high point in the estate and will be visually prominent from views within the estate to the south west, south and south east and east and also from more wide-reaching views in these directions.
- The submitted covering letter largely ignores these important views and focuses solely on views of the site from the vehicular access to the estate to the east and from the neighbouring properties.
- As noted in the officer's report for previous applications on the site, the impact on the historic parkland landscape character and in turn the setting of the listed buildings and the significance of the designated heritage assets was an important consideration.
- The wider country estate forms part of the setting of listed buildings and the site forms part of the remnants of historic parkland. Development of the scale proposed in this location would also physically and visually interrupt the landscape with urbanising form. There would be harm to landscape character and the setting of designated heritage assets, which would not be outweighed by any public benefit.
- In terms of the scale of the building, at 8.5 metres to ridge it is almost double the height of the agricultural smallholding shed that sits behind the mature trees and hedge to the east of the application site at Sneyd Arms Farm. It therefore does not respect the scale of surrounding buildings.
- In determining the application for the agricultural building at Sneyd Arms Farm, officers considered that at 4.6m ridge height, the building would be relatively low in profile and, due to the vegetation screening to the south and west, it be unlikely to be seen prominently or even noticeably in any more wide-reaching landscape views.
- The same conclusion cannot be reached for the current application. At 8.5 metres to ridge, its exposed location at a high point in the estate, which is visually prominent to wider views to the south and across the Basford Estate and beyond, it will visually interrupt and intrude the open nature of the countryside and would be detrimental to the parkland landscape.
- As well as this, the building will tower above the adjacent hedgerows and Sneyd Arms Farm building, essentially placing it in clear line of sight seen from all directions.
- The proposals [as first submitted] also omit any details of proposals for an access road to the proposed building. The submitted covering letter does not mention any works to provide a suitable access route to the building and the Proposed Site Plan refers to an existing agricultural track with no changes proposed as part of this application.
- No consideration appears to have been given to fire risk.
- It is unclear why the applicant has chosen to locate the building in this location, on a previously undeveloped and exposed part of the 300+ hectare estate. Note too that this area of the estate is used by a long-term tenant for grazing cows.
- Position is remote from the points of need – the two biomass boilers
- Concern about noise disturbance to neighbour's equine (dressage) practice area

- Effective from Jan 2024 residents of five properties owned by the Estate have been given end of tenancy notices
- 10 properties are privately owned in the hamlet; 12 properties are within the Basford Hall Estate. Of these 12, there are 3 already converted to holiday lets (until recently residential) and 5 properties where tenants have been served notice. It will have a detrimental effect on the Hamlet. Currently, a loss of 30% of its residential housing and a potential loss of 50%.

### **Cheddleton Parish Council**

- 6.2 Recommend refusal on grounds that there are no details on the size and access.

### **Churnet Valley Conservation Society**

- 6.3 The applicant does not provide sufficient information and detail to properly assess and determine the impact of the development. Basford hall is a historical parkland and as such should be protected from harm. Recent developments on the Basford Hall estate have had a significant harmful impact on the Estate and its heritage assets. The retrospective track already twice refused, development of Rock Cottage impacting on the grade 2 listed Bath House and The Folly, and construction of track across the Churnet Valley claiming it to be an existing track (SMC/2023/0307 and SMD/2022/0654). There has been a complete lack of enforcement on these issues. All these applications are in conflict with NPPF and Core Strategy [sic] DC2 Historic Environment.
- 6.4 This application is in conflict with NPPF and Core Strategy [sic] DC1 and DC3 because it is an overbearing industrial sized shed, not in keeping with the landscape character and the design of this shed has not considered the neighbouring properties. Grade 2 listed Sneyd Arms Farm and the estate's own Lodge Cottages 1,2 and 3. It is not sympathetic to the character of the local environment. The hedgerows between the already existing shed and the proposed shed will be damaged by the lack of any sunlight and so in conflict with policy NE2. There is no access. There is no existing track. A large-scale development of an industrial sized building will be detrimental to the heritage assets in the area and to the historic parkland landscape.

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

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

- 7.1 In its general approach, in accordance with policy SS1, the Council expects the development and use of land to contribute positively to the social, economic and environmental improvement of the Staffordshire Moorlands. When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. This means that planning applications that accord with the policies in

the Local Plan shall be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7.2 Policy SS10 for the rural areas says that:

“These areas will provide only for development which has an essential need to be located in the countryside, supports the rural diversification and sustainability of the rural areas, promotes sustainable tourism or enhances the countryside. The Council and its partners will achieve this through the following actions: [numbered 1 to 6].

7.3 Of potential relevance to this application is SS10(2) to sustain the rural economy by [second point] “supporting the diversification of existing farm enterprises”. The agent for the application also cites the intention of the policy under SS10(2) of “enabling the limited expansion or development of business for employment uses where a rural location can be justified”.

7.4 SS10(3) is to Enhance and conserve the quality of the countryside by [first point]: Giving priority to the need to protect the quality and character of the area and requiring all development proposals to respect and respond sensitively to the distinctive qualities of the surrounding landscape; and [third point] ensuring renewable energy schemes are of an appropriate scale, type and location.

7.5 From the supporting information submitted the Basford Hall Estate is managing some 300 acres of ‘commercial woodland’. There are also some 200 acres of farm land which are let out on annual grazing licences. These management approaches began in year 2000. A 10 year management plan for the woodlands on the estate is currently in preparation.

#### Conclusion with regard to the principle of the development

7.6 This is a proposal linked with rural activity, in this case forestry, and it is linked with the estate’s buildings – the supply of wood-chip fuel as a means of heating and therefore in principle can be seen to be essentially located in terms of SS10 policy for the rural areas.

#### Main issues

7.7 The main issues are:

- impact on the character and appearance of the area
- heritage impacts on the settings of Listed Buildings
- heritage impacts on the non-designated heritage assets of the Basford Hall historic park land
- impacts for neighbouring residents especially possible noise

#### Other issues

7.8 Residents are concerned that the development will support and encourage perhaps un-controlled damage to long established extensive woodlands of the estate of which they say there has already been some experience with the Forestry Commission re-stocking notice having been imposed.



- 7.9 Residents therefore see a 'bigger picture' contradiction in terms of environmental sustainability.
- 7.10 The application shows that the timber source will chiefly be from Consall Woods on the opposite side of the Churnet Valley and with the recent refusal of SMD/2023/0307 for a lengthy track to and from the valley bottom residents argue there must be some significant uncertainty as to the practicalities in the overall estate plan. These matters will also be considered below.

### **Siting and Design**

- 7.11 The site is certainly somewhat exposed in its near surroundings, especially from the main drive approach to Basford Hall. It is also likely to be prominently visible from the end of the public road up to the hall drive entrance. This has consequences for the heritage setting of the hall and the historic significance of its parkland landscape. It will also have implications for the setting of the separately Listed Lodge to the hall which directly faces the site.
- 7.12 That said, the chosen site is set well to one side of the main focus of the hall approach. The hall drive is also lined by a very strong avenue of large mature broadleaved trees. With the submission of a proposed screen planting scheme the likely adverse visual impacts can be mitigated. With dark green cladding (as proposed) and provided a similar dark green is used for the roof colour, the visual intrusion can be effectively reduced by these recessive finishes.

### **Heritage**

- 7.13 Historic Environment Policy DC2 of the Local Plan is to give protection to designated heritage assets and their settings and non-designated heritage assets as set out in the NPPF. NPPF paragraph 205 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, "great weight should be given to the asset's conservation". Paragraph 206 goes on to say that: "any harm or loss [to a heritage asset] should require clear and convincing justification."
- 7.14 NPPF paragraph 202 states that: "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use."
- 7.15 For a non-designated heritage asset the requirement is set at NPPF 203 which says that: "In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset."
- 7.16 The relevant designated assets for consideration here are the hall, the lodge and Lodge Farm. The impacts need to be assessed by considering the

importance or significance of the currently open field land area to the historic setting of these various buildings. It should also be noted that the proposed mitigation planting could itself be regarded as interfering with the historic layout and landscape. Relevant to this is to note that the grounds are identified as historic park land and constitute a non-designated heritage asset. The tree-lined drive to the hall should be regarded as being part of the hall curtilage. In this case it is not considered that the proposal site, its access route or its screen planting should be considered part of the curtilage. The development does not require Listed Building consent.

- 7.17 Subject to the implementation of the screen planting as proposed it is judged reasonable to conclude that the development in this case would be 'neutral' in its effects on heritage.

### **Amenity**

- 7.18 The building has the potential to be visible from some adjacent un-related residential properties. It is not though considered that it would be overbearing or otherwise unacceptable in terms of its physical presence and siting.
- 7.19 As regards noise the applicant says no machine working is involved. The concerns of the neighbours are though understandable and it must be recommended in event of approval that an appropriate condition worded in consultation with the Environmental Health Officer be attached to control and avoid undue noise disturbance. The specific concerns of a neighbour where equine dressage practice occurs some 60m to 120m away are to be noted. The suggested noise condition should be helpful in limiting any disturbance.

### **Other matters**

- 7.20 Concerns raised about the proximity of the building to the adjacent boundary hedges and trees are understandable. In event of approval a condition should be attached to require the building including the construction work to take place outside of the root protection zones, details of which shall be submitted, and notwithstanding the submitted drawings the building position shall be adjusted as necessary.
- 7.21 Concerns about haulage impacts are also understandable together with queries about how materials will be brought to the store. The agent has responded that wood chip will be brought "via the existing road that serves the wider Basford estate". The track refused under retrospective application SMD/2023/0307 is said by the agent to no longer be present having been returned to grass following the refusal. In so far as haulage traffic will occur it must be recognised that this will happen whether the development takes place here or continues at the former farm buildings at the Hall. For the size of building the level of traffic should not be excessive.
- 7.22 Objectors question the need to keep machines undercover, question their intended purpose and draw connection with a joint business venture they say is

in place with an accommodation / wedding venue nearby but this appears to be speculation and certainly isn't part of the proposal. For the LPA the proposal has a rationale and purpose which is generally understandable. Consideration of alternative locations such as closer to Basford Hall on the site of their former farm building could be brought into the assessment especially if this new location were found unacceptable.

- 7.23 Concern that the development will only serve to generate increased felling of timber from the local woods is also understandable and the large scale timbers stacked at the site and the apparently un-authorised recent felling do not encourage an entirely favourable impression. Nevertheless the estate does have significant woodland within which there are commercial forest stands. Felling and woodland management on a forestry scale is subject to its own controls through the Forestry Commission. The background to the requirement is reasonably well set out in the application and appears justified.

## **8. CONCLUSION AND PLANNING BALANCE**

- 8.1 In conclusion the development can be accepted in principle as needing to be in a rural location due specifically to its role in association with the workings of the Basford Hall Estate.
- 8.2 The building is sufficiently distanced from neighbours not to be found overbearing. A noise control condition can be attached.
- 8.3 The building design is conventional for its type and with the screen planting proposed can be made acceptable in this field fringe position. The location has the potential to be sensitive to the setting of several heritage assets being affected but again with the planting proposed it is judged its impacts can be mitigated sufficiently so that there is no harm to the historic significance.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

### **A. Approve subject to the following conditions:-**

- 1. The development hereby approved shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 51 of the Town and Country Planning, Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.**
- 2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details as submitted in the application form and submitted specifications and as shown in drawings:  
AL 01 Site plan; Proposed elevations and floor plan drawing  
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted details and approved plans, in the interests of good planning, for clarity and the avoidance of doubt.**

- 3. Notwithstanding condition 2 and the plans hereby approved the building shall be positioned to stand a minimum of 8.0m clear at its closest point from the centre line of the adjacent hedgerows to the north and east edges of the site.**  
**Reason: To safeguard the existing well established tree and hedge boundary in the interests of landscape, biodiversity and amenity.**
- 4. Above the exposed concrete panel base walls of the development hereby approved the exterior walls shall be finished in dark green vertical metal cladding and the roof shall be finished in dark green or dark grey coloured panels.**  
**Reason: To assist in minimising the conspicuousness of the building in the area.**
- 5. Before the end of the first available planting season (November to February inclusive) following completion of the development hereby approved or its first coming into use whichever is the earlier the scheme of tree and shrub planting shown on site plan drawing AL 01 hereby approved shall have been implemented complete with fencing measures to protect the plants from grazing by livestock or wild animals. Any plants which die or are lost or otherwise fail to establish in the first five years following the completion of the planting shall be replaced in the next available planting season with plants of the form and size as originally planted. The planting shall thereafter be allowed to grow and be maintained for the lifetime of the development.**  
**Reason: In the interests of the visual appearance of the development, biodiversity and the amenities of the area.**
- 6. [Restrictive condition to be advised by SMDC Environmental Health to control noise from the occupation and operational use of the building hereby approved.]**  
**Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the living conditions for occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.**

### **Informative**

- 1. This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process and thorough discussion with the applicants. In accordance with Paragraph 38 of the NPPF the Case Officer has sought solutions where possible to secure a development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.**

**B In the event of any changes being needed to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions/informatives/planning obligations or reasons for approval/refusal) prior to the decision being issued, the Head of Development Services has delegated authority to do so in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee,**

provided that the changes do not exceed the substantive nature of the Committee's decision

## 10. APPENDICES TO THE REPORT

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

<http://publicaccess.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/portal/servlets/ApplicationSearchServlet?PKID=177609>

## 10.2 – location plan

