

Officers Report

Case Reference: 25/00899/FUL
Location: Shippon Cottage Tunshill Lane Milnrow Rochdale OL16 3TS
Proposal: Erection of replacement stable building including associated landscaping works.
Recommendation: Refuse
Officer: Bob Melling

SITE DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

The application relates to a stable building within the curtilage of Shippon Cottage, which is listed at Grade II for its special architectural and historic interest. The Cottage was originally built as a farmhouse and has a datestone of 1622. It is built of sandstone with mullioned windows, some of which have hoodmoulds. The farmhouse later came to be used as a shippon associated with Carr Farm adjacent to the site, before falling into dereliction. The farmhouse was restored and extended in the 1990s. There are no records of the stables being built, although they appear to have been in situ for several years. The stables are timber and of modest proportions. They are not curtilage listed however they are within the immediate setting of the farmhouse.

The barn and farmhouse at Carr Farm are depicted on the first edition OS map from c.1850 and while altered retain original features, including the arched entrance to the barn. Both buildings are still legible as vernacular, rural buildings and meet the criteria for assessment as non-designated heritage assets. They also make a positive contribution to the setting of the listed Shippon Cottage.

The application site is located in the Green Belt and the topography is varied with the ground levels falling away in an east-west direction towards the M62.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a replacement stable building including land re-profiling works. The stables would have a rectangular footprint measuring 16.9m by 8.1m with a height to eaves of 2.7m and a ridge height of 4.1m. The building would be finished externally using stone with slate roof coverings. It would occupy a similar position on the site as the existing stables, although the substantial uplift in footprint would necessitate engineering works to raise the ground levels, particularly to the west of the building, in order to create a level platform.

RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

99/D36121 - Revised Internal Alterations In Respect Of Proposed Conversion Of Barn To Dwelling - Granted (March 1999)

98/D35823 - Alterations And Extension To Former Listed Cottage To Form Dwelling And Detached Garage - Granted subject to conditions (December 1998)

98/D35822 - Alterations And Extensions To Former Cottage To Form Dwelling And Detached Garage And Siting Of Temporary Mobile Home During Building Works - Granted subject to conditions (December 1998)

94/D30564 - Alterations And Conversion Of Listed Building To Form Dwelling Including Erection Of Single Storey Extension - Granted subject to conditions (May 1994)

94/D30563 - Change Of Use And Conversion Of Barn To Form Dwelling Including Erection Of Single Storey Extension And Retrospective Application For Temporary Siting Of Mobile Home - Granted subject to conditions (May 1994)

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) 2024:

JP-S1 Sustainable Development

JP-S4 Flood Risk and the Water Environment

JP-G1 Landscape Character

JP-G8 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

JP-G9 The Green Belt

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

JP-P2 Heritage

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

G8 Managing water resources and flood risk

G9 Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability

P2 Protecting and Enhancing Character, Landscape and Heritage

P3 Improving Design of New Development

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General Development Requirements

PUBLICITY

The application was publicised via neighbour notification letters, two site notices and an advert in the local press.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

Policy Position

Inappropriate Development

The application site is located within the Green Belt as allocated under PfE Policy JP-G9. The NPPF states that: *'The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence'*.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF establishes that:

When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF sets out that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it meets one of the exceptions. In the submitted 'Green Belt Statement' (Ref: 147.25), exception d) has been identified as relevant to the replacement stable building:

d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

Therefore, the main consideration in assessing the principle of development is whether the proposed stable building constitutes inappropriate development in the

Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances have been demonstrated which may outweigh the presumption against development.

While the new building would be in the same use as the building it replaces, it would also be materially larger. This is acknowledged in the applicant's Green Belt assessment, with a noted volume increase of 178%. As such, it is concluded that that replacement stables would not meet exception d).

Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that the proposals would result in significant land re-profiling works in order to enable a level platform for the stables. It is noted that in some areas the increase in ground levels would be over 4m. While a section drawing has been provided, there is insufficient detail to understand the extent of the engineering works, including how the area will be landscaped and whether retaining walls would be required. Notwithstanding, it was observed during a site visit that the required increase in ground levels would appear substantial.

Although the applicant did not consider any other Green Belt exception to be relevant to the replacement stable building, the proposal has also been considered against other potentially relevant Green Belt exceptions, including paragraph 154(b) of the NPPF. Exception b) allows for the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, provided that the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Whilst it is acknowledged that stables may be associated with outdoor recreation, the scale and massing of the proposed building, together with the associated engineering works involving the raising of land levels, would result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The replacement stable building and associated works would also constitute an encroachment into the undisturbed countryside to the west of the existing stables, which is not considered to form previously developed land. The proposal is therefore not considered to satisfy the requirements of this exception.

Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The NPPF is explicit in that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 144 of the NPPF states that when considering any application, LPAs should ensure that substantial weight is given to any Green Belt harm. Unless the Green Belt harm by way of inappropriateness, and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations, 'very special circumstances' will not exist.

What results in very special circumstances is not defined within either the NPPF or local policy. There could be a single and substantial factor that clearly outweighs the harms, or a number of seemingly ordinary benefits which, when considered in isolation might not be individually particularly noteworthy, but collectively, clearly outweigh the harms, to amount to 'very special circumstances' existing. The weight given to any particular factor, and their combination, is a matter of planning judgement for the decision taker.

In accordance with paragraph 153 of the NPPF, this report will evaluate harm to the Green Belt, any other harm and any other considerations, before coming to a conclusion as to whether very special circumstances exist. In assessing harm, the following weight has been ascribed to each matter either in favour or against the proposed development:

- Neutral;
- Limited;
- Moderate;
- Significant; or
- Substantial.

Harm to the Green Belt

Harm by Definition

Having established that there is definitional harm, it is necessary to consider other forms of harm to the Green Belt. The next sub sections will therefore consider the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and the impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

Impact on Openness

Paragraph 142 of the NPPF sets out that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Given that the development has been identified as being inappropriate, the next test is to assess the impact of the development upon the openness of the Green Belt.

Planning Practice Guidance provides further advice on what factors can be taken into account when considering the potential impact of development on openness. This guidance clarifies that assessing this impact requires a judgment based on the circumstances of the case in question. Furthermore, the guidance gives a number of examples where the courts have identified a number of matters which might need to be taken into account in making the assessment. In summary these include, but are not limited to:

- Openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects;
- The duration of the development, and its irremediability;
- The degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation or use of the land by future occupiers.

As alluded to above, openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt that has spatial as well as visual aspects.

The existing timber stables read as a modest ancillary feature within the grounds of the farmhouse. The existing stables are considered to blend in with the rising topography while the materials assist in assimilating the stables into the rural landscape.

The proposed stables, however, would constitute a significant uplift in built form with a 129% increase in footprint and a 178% increase in volume. To enable a level platform for the proposed stables, the ground levels would be raised significantly, and this would further increase the prominence of the stables.

While the building would benefit from some natural screening from mature trees to the south, it is recognised that this screening is only truly possible when the trees are in full leaf. This was evident during the Case Officer's site visit. Otherwise, the site and stables are visible from the nearby public right of way.

The application site effectively sits in a ribbon of existing development which is physically separated from the wider countryside, however the proposed stables and associated re-profiling works would extend further west into an undeveloped area of land which reads more clearly as undisturbed countryside.

The proposal introduces a substantially larger stable building that would have a greater footprint than the associated farmhouse while also being brought closer to the adjacent public right of way. It would involve significant re-profiling and landscaping works that would also be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt.

It is considered that there would be a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt by the simple merit of the quantum of development proposed compared to that which currently exists.

Overall, the development would result in harm to spatial and visual openness, contrary to the requirements of paragraph 142 of the NPPF. It is now important to consider the impact of the proposal on the purposes that land within the Green Belt should serve.

Impact on Purposes

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF sets out that Green Belt serves the following five purposes:

- a. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b. To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d. To reserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

A) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

The development applied for is not significant enough in size to contribute towards what could be considered to constitute a sprawl of a large built-up area and it would not conflict with this purpose.

B) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.

The development and application site involved with this application serves no purpose in preventing neighbouring towns merging and as such it would not conflict with this purpose.

C) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Despite the urbanising features adjacent to the site, the site undoubtedly has a strong distinction with the surrounding countryside. The development would therefore result in encroachment into the countryside and would have a limited impact on this purpose.

D) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

The application site does not abut an identified historic settlement and does not have a physical or visual relationship to the setting or significance of an historic town. The proposed development would not conflict with this purpose.

E) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

The application site does not conflict with this purpose as it does not assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Green Belt Conclusion

The development is inappropriate development within the Green Belt and therefore, is harmful by definition. In terms of harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt, Officers have considered the proposal having regard to its individual merits, including its location, scale and form and the site context and the development would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt as discussed above. Consequently, the development negatively impacts upon both spatial and visual openness. In conclusion, the conflict with purposes, taken together with the impact upon openness and definitional harm by reason of inappropriateness, culminate that very substantial weight should be attached to the harm to the Green Belt as a result of the proposal.

The development is unacceptable in principle.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF requires analysis of other considerations in the planning balance and these are set out below.

Design and Heritage

The NPPF establishes that achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is reflected in PpE Policy JP-P1 and CS Policies

DM1 and P3, which require development to respect local context with regard to siting, size, scale, massing, height and materials.

When considering applications affecting listed buildings, Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities (LPAs) to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states that '*any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.*' Paragraph 215 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.*' The impact of a development on a non-designated heritage asset is also a material planning consideration. A balanced judgement should be had, having regard to the significance of the asset and the scale of any harm or loss. At a local level, PfE Policy JP-P2 and CS Policy P2 apply. Policy P2 seeks to conserve, enhance and promote key heritage assets, which include listed buildings.

Significance, as defined in the NPPF, is:

The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.

The setting of a heritage asset, as defined in the NPPF, is:

The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

The existing timber stables are modest in proportions and in its design, and is not unduly intrusive within the setting of the listed building. The proposed stables would be built in stone with a substantially greater footprint and volume than the existing. The proposed footprint would appear to be comparable to that of the listed Cottage. Their size and scale and the stone construction would all mean that they would be substantially more prominent and intrusive in the setting of the listed building than the existing timber stables and would no longer read as a modest ancillary feature in the grounds. The new stables would be an intrusive form of development within the setting of the listed building and would result in less than substantial harm to its significance.

The plans indicate that uPVC would be used for the windows. The windows on both existing and proposed buildings should be timber. The approved plans at the time of the conversion of the farmhouse show timber windows and doors. The uPVC

windows installed in the farmhouse would appear to be unauthorised and cannot be used as justification for uPVC windows on the other buildings.

The sections indicate that the land levels would need to be raised to enable a level platform for the stables. Given the limited details provided regarding the extent of the engineering works it is not possible to fully assess the impacts on the listed building.

The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building as a result of intrusive and incongruous development within its setting. It is not considered that this harm has been adequately justified. Having due regard to PfE Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2, CS Policies DM1, P2 and P3, the SPD and the NPPF, it is considered that the development would have a significant harmful impact on Shippon Cottage and its setting.

Residential Amenity

The replacement stables would remain in the same use as the existing stables and would be located a similar distance away from the nearest residential property at Carr Farm. It is not considered that the proposals would result in an intensification of the existing use that would result in undue harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Therefore, neutral weight is attributed against the development in this regard.

Highways

The development is not considered to have an adverse impact on highway safety and would not generate a level of additional traffic which would have a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the immediate local highway network, or strategic routes. Therefore, neutral weight is attributed against the development in this regard.

Drainage

Saved UPD Policy EM/7 and CS Policy G8 require development proposals to prevent an increased risk of flooding and to ensure the satisfactory disposal of surface water. This includes the incorporation of appropriate measures for the management of surface and flood water, including Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

Given the scale of development, including the re-profiling works, and the varied topography of the site, it is considered that a surface water drainage strategy would be necessary to demonstrate compliance with the aforementioned policies. However, this information could be conditioned in the event of an approval. On this basis, neutral weight is attributed against the development regarding drainage.

Ecology

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity,

providing net gains where possible, and contributing to the Government's commitment to halt decline. CS policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

PfE policy JP-G9 seeks to deliver a net enhancement of biodiversity resources through a collective of measures which are broadly aligned with the approach to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) outlined within the Environment Act (2021), the NPPF and supporting guidance documents. The provisions of the Environment Act in respect of BNG are a statutory requirement for planning applications.

The Greater Manchester Ecology Unit was consulted on the application and confirmed that no further surveys would be required if the proposed development only impacted the existing stables.

The submitted Tree Survey has identified a group of trees (G4) to the immediate south of the proposed stables which are of moderate quality and in good condition. The proposed site plan indicates that no trees would be removed, however it is unclear whether the proposed building and associated re-profiling works, including foundations and retaining structures, would affect the root protection areas of the trees. The loss of trees should be avoided as the trees are on neighbouring land where replacement planting could not be sought. In the event of an approval, the LPA would require a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement prior to any development (including any demolition, site clearance or preparation works) taking place. This is to demonstrate that the retention of the trees, as shown on the proposed site plan, would be possible.

It is noted that the development would comply with the de minimis BNG exemption. Accordingly, it is not considered that the statutory requirement to provide 10% BNG is applicable. Notwithstanding, biodiversity enhancements are still expected as per local and national planning policy.

Overall, it is considered that biodiversity enhancements could be delivered through suitable landscaping and the requirement for biodiversity enhancement features such as bee bricks, bat and/or bird bricks/boxes or other similar features, which can be required via condition. Furthermore, a pre-commencement condition could be applied to ensure the submission of the necessary details regarding the protection of the trees identified as G4 on the submitted Tree Survey. Therefore, neutral weight is attributed against the development in this regard.

VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

A Court of Appeal judgement in *Redhill Aerodrome Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* establishes that 'any other harm' in paragraph 153 of the NPPF includes non-Green Belt harm that is to be taken into account in the weighing exercise of the planning balance as to determining whether or not very special circumstances exist which would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by inappropriateness and any other harm.

This Court of Appeal judgment is an important reminder that under paragraph 153 of the NPPF, when considering any planning application concerning proposed

development in the Green Belt, LPAs should continue to ensure that substantial weight is given to harm to the Green Belt and any other harm.

In light of the above assessment, it is necessary to now consider whether there are 'very special circumstances' which clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt (arising from the inappropriate development discussed above) and any other harm resulting from the proposal as set out in paragraph 153 of the NPPF.

THE APPLICANT'S CASE

The applicant has identified several public benefits and very special circumstances. These include improved animal welfare through the provision of enhanced facilities; the contribution of horses to the rural character of the land; the investment in local materials and labour during the construction phase of the development; and improved site security through the provision of a more secure structure with greater visibility over the area.

THE COUNCIL'S ASSESSMENT

The applicant has advanced a number of considerations which are intended to amount to very special circumstances, however these are not considered, either individually or cumulatively, to clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt and other harm. While some weight can be afforded to improved animal welfare, the proposal has not demonstrated that such benefits could not be achieved through a scheme of materially lesser scale that would preserve Green Belt openness, and therefore this carries only limited weight.

The suggestion that the presence of horses would contribute positively to rural character is noted, however the equestrian use of the land already exists, and this benefit is not dependent on the construction of a materially larger building. The use of local materials and an improved design approach is acknowledged, however the NPPF makes clear that the essential characteristics of the Green Belt are its openness and permanence, and improvements to appearance do not mitigate harm arising from increased scale and bulk. Similarly, the economic benefits associated with construction employment are temporary in nature and attract only very limited weight in the planning balance. The claim that the development would reduce opportunities for crime through increased security is also afforded limited weight in the absence of substantive evidence of existing issues or that such benefits could not be achieved through less harmful means. Consequently, these considerations, whether taken individually or together, do not amount to the very special circumstances necessary to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and loss of openness, together with the identified heritage harm to the setting of the listed building.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that decision should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development by

approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 153 also states that when considering any planning application, LPAs should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The LPA has identified that the proposed development would represent inappropriate development in the Green Bel including harm to the openness of the Green Belt and countryside encroachment. Other harm has also been identified in terms of the less than substantial harm to the setting of a listed building. The NPPF requires substantial weight to be given to any harm to the Green Belt, including any other harm. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated that would clearly outweigh the identified harm and support the grant of planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning permission is refused for the following reasons:

SUMMARY OF THIRD-PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

5 letters of objection were received raising the following concerns:

- Large vehicles delivering construction materials could weaken a retaining wall along the single-track lane.
- Noise disturbance from delivery vehicles.
- Negative impact on the listed building.
- Impact on wildlife.
- There is a bat colony in the roof of the existing stables.
- Harmful impact on the Green Belt.
- They intend to use the new stables for residential use and for keeping dogs.
- The existing stables were built as a temporary structure without planning permission.

Officer's note: Concerns relating to the conversion of the existing garage have not been summarised as this part of the scheme has been removed.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Conservation Officer (Summary):

The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of Shippon Cottage. This harm does not appear to have been adequately justified. It should be weighed against any public benefits stemming from the proposal.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (Summary):

If only the stable (B3 within the Roost Assessment) will be impacted as a result of this application, then no further surveys will be required.

With regard to Biodiversity Net Gain, the application is described as being exempt from statutory requirements under the de minimis exemption and we have no reason to doubt this assessment. As such, the statutory Biodiversity Gain Condition will not apply.

Should any future applications be submitted for works on B1 or B2, the nocturnal bat surveys will be required prior to determination.

PROCEDURAL STATEMENT

Article 35 Declaration

The development does not comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application

Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application. In particular due regard has been afforded to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

The application has been considered in accordance with the Rochdale Equity, Diversity and Inclusion policy – Embracing All Voices (2024-2026), which seeks to promote a culture of equity, diversity and inclusion that benefit the community as a whole.

Recommendation: Refuse

Refusal(s) (2)

- 1 The proposed development comprises inappropriate development in the Green Belt that is harmful by definition and furthermore, fails to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it through encroachment. Very special circumstances do not exist as the identified harm (by definition and other harm) is not clearly outweighed by other considerations, and the application is therefore contrary to policies PfE Policy JP-G9 (The Green Belt) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2 The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building as a result of intrusive and incongruous development within its setting. The proposed development is therefore visually harmful and detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, contrary to PfE Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2, CS Policies DM1, P2 and P3, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 1 For the avoidance of doubt, the decision notice relates to the following plans supporting reports:

- 'BS5837 Tree Survey' by Lakeland Tree Consultancy dated October 2025
- 'Preliminary Roost Assessment' by Arbtech Consulting Ltd dated 13/08/2025
- 'BNG Exemption Statement' by Arbtech Consulting Ltd dated 21/11/25
- 'Planning Statement' by BCAE Architects dated August 2025
- 'Planning Response' by BCAE Architects dated 10/02/2026
- 'Heritage Statement' by Kate Bellwood Associates dated September 2025
- 'Green Belt Statement'. Ref: 147.25. Dated 09/10/2025
- Location Plan. Dwg no. E000. Rev A
- Existing Site Plan. Dwg no. E001. Rev A
- Existing Site Plan Demolition. Dwg no. E002. Rev A
- Existing Plans Shippon Cottage. Dwg no. E100
- Existing Plans Shippon Cottage – Stables. Dwg no. E120
- Existing Elevations Shippon Cottage. Dwg no. E200
- Proposed Site Plan. Dwg no. PL001. Rev A
- Proposed Site Plan. Dwg no. PL002. Rev A
- Proposed Site Plan Overlay. Dwg no. PL003
- Proposed Plans Shippon Cottage – Stables. Dwg no. PL130. Rev A

- Proposed Plans Site Sections. Dwg no. PL140

2

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.