APPLICATION NUMBER: 21/00411/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
21/00411/FUL	Ryan Killeen	13 July 2021

Address: Festhigh Barn Hollands Farm Rooley Moor Road Rochdale OL12 6BN

Proposal: Erection of a stable/storage building following demolition of the existing stable building.

PUBLICITY	**Weekly list expired?**	Y	**Site notice expired?**	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	**Press Notice expired?**	N/A

DELEGATION	**Significant departure from local plan?**	N	**Contrary to national policy?**	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	**Contrary to previous decision?**	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	**Called in or Planning Panel objection?**	N

COMMENTS	**Planning Panel comments received?**	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	**Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?**	N/A

CONDITIONS	**Pre-commencement conditions proposed?**	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RG **DATE: 13 July 2021**

SITE

This application relates to an existing stable block adjacent to Festhigh Barn, a two-storey barn conversion set off Rooley Moor Road approximately 3km northwest of Rochdale Town Centre, and within the Green Belt, as defined by saved UDP policy G/D/2. The stable building is of a blockwork construction with untreated render finish and includes a rectangular footprint, being formed with a simple dual-pitch slate roof. The front elevation features two stable doors and high level windows.

The site is situated approximately 115m from Rooley Moor Road, separated by open fields to the west which extend to the south and north, providing a rural character to the site.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks permission for the replacement of the existing stable block with a new stable building that is more appropriate for its intended stabling use, and provides storage room space.

The proposed building is to have a footprint of 8m x 9m, and is formed with a dual-pitch 'saltbox' roof form which provides an asymmetrical gable elevation. The building is to be constructed from blockwork with roof slates and wooden stable doors.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – June 2019
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

DM1	General development requirements
SD1	Delivering sustainable development
SO3	**Improving design, image and quality of place**
P1	Improving image
P3	Improving design of new development
SO4	**Promoting a Greener Environment**
G4	Protecting Green Belt Land
G6	Enhancing Green Infrastructure
G7	Enhancing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity
G8	Managing water resources and flood risk
G9	Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability
SO5	**Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport**
T2	Improving accessibility

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/2 Green Belt

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development (June 2016).

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

21/00418/HH42	Prior notification for a single storey extension measuring 4.75m from the rear of the original dwelling (with a maximum height of 3.07m and height to eaves 2.87m). Refused 27th April 2021: Condition 5 of planning permission 04/D42961 states that notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 no development falling within Classes A,B,C,D,E,F,G, or H of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the said Order shall be carried out at the site. The proposal therefore does not constitute permitted development under Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
04/D42961	Partial Demolition Of Part Of Dwelling And Barn, Removal Of Dormer And Raising Of Eaves To Form Dwelling. Granted STC.
03/D41267	Change Of Use And Conversion Of Existing Barn With Living Accommodation To Form Two Dwellings Including Two Storey Side Extension. Granted STC

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

N/A

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to all surrounding properties and a notice posted in the vicinity of the site. No responses were received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development – Green Belt

The application site is designated under saved UDP policy G/D/2 and therefore the contents of Core Strategy Policy G4 is relevant. Policy G4 seeks to restrict development in the Green Belt to where it would be deemed not to be inappropriate by national planning policies unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated.

In relation to the proposed stable building, paragraph 145 of the NPPF indicates that "a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt", subject to the following exceptions:

a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original 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;
e) limited infilling in villages;
f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:
    a. not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
    b. not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

In assessing this application, it is not considered that the proposal would conflict with any of the five purposes of the Green Belt, identified within paragraph 134 of the NPPF. Although the built form is located away from the neighbouring property, it will remain within the established residential curtilage. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would contribute to sprawl. Further to this, the proposal would not prejudice that aim of urban regeneration.

Therefore, the main consideration in assessing the principle of development is whether the proposed scheme constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances have been demonstrated which may outweigh the presumption against development.

Paragraph d) allows for the replacement of a building, provided that the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than the building which it replaces. As it is not contested that the use is to remain the same, the key consideration is

therefore whether the new building is materially larger than the one it is set to replace.

The floor space and volume of buildings both existing and proposed are set out below with a calculation of the net difference.

	Existing	Proposed	Difference (%)
Floor Space (m^2)	22.58	71.85	+218
Volume (m^3)	62	260.1	+299

Evidently, the proposal would comprise a replacement building that is substantially (and therefore materially) larger than the one which currently exists, and the proposal is therefore unable to rely on exemption d) and constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt, which by definition, is harmful.

Impact on Character and Appearance

Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design. In addition, paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping. Further to this, the "Guidelines and standards for residential development SPD" requires all Extensions and alterations to existing properties to be in keeping with the host property.

The existing building is of modest proportions, with a footprint of approximately 6m x 3.6m. The building is marginally set into the surrounding landscape but does read as a prominent addition in the context of the surrounding residential properties by virtue of it's siting to the front elevation, and is visible upon approaching the properties. The building is finished in an untreated render which has weathered and the building currently detracts from the overall character and appearance of the area as a consequence. The surrounding uses and buildings generally have a strong rural character with an identifiable palette of materials with stone wall construction a particular characteristic of the immediate surroundings.

The proposal would seek to introduce a structure that is approximately 3 times larger than the building it is to replace with similar design principles. Despite its single storey form, the siting and size of the structure would introduce a dominative form to the area which would be read upon approach to the main dwelling. This would significantly alter the relationship between the dwelling houses with which the stable building shares its curtilage.

Although there is an absence of details on the finish of the building, with a suggestion to be agreed via condition, it is stated within the application form that the building is to be constructed from blockwork. The proposed design and materiality of the proposed building would consequently present as distinctly industrial and would juxtapose the traditional agricultural qualities of the site. Whilst the building would be marginally, set below the landscape to the west, it would include engineering works

to remove earth and existing landscaping immediately to the north, exacerbating the prominence of the proposal in its local context and producing a building that is incongruous and fails to respond sympathetically to the setting.

Given the unsatisfactory design of the proposal, particularly when considered in the context of its surroundings, the application fails to accord with policy P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Amenity

The proposed building is to have an identical use to the existing building, at a similar intensity given two individual stables are to be provided, with some storage space. The intensity of the use is not expected to result in any undue impacts to residential amenity in terms of activity form the building, however there will be an impact on visual amenity with respect to the loss of openness and increased building footprint located to the front of the adjacent dwellings.

Planning Balance

Paragraphs 143 and 144 of the NPPF state that, as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The proposed storage building would result in harm through inappropriateness and additional harm to the Green Belt has been identified in respect of the design and visual appearance of the proposed stable building.

No material considerations have been identified that would constitute 'Very Special Circumstances' to overcome the harm identified through inappropriateness, and as such the application therefore fails to accord with policy G4 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and the expectations and requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the protection of Green Belt land. As such, the proposed development is unacceptable in principle and the application is accordingly recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

1 The proposed replacement building would be materially larger than the one it replaces and therefore would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt which is harmful by definition and would also result in harm to openness of the Green Belt. Additionally, the proposed building is considered to represent a visually harmful form of development that fails to respond sympathetically to its setting, juxtaposing the traditional agricultural qualities of the site and is ultimately of an unsatisfactory standard of design. No very special circumstances have been submitted to outweigh the harm that would arise to the Green Belt. The application is therefore contrary to policies P3, G4 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

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.

Notes for Applicant:

In the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following list of plans:

Location Plan
21.2482.1 – Existing Elevations and Floor Plan
21.2482.4 – Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations
21.2482.6 – Existing and Proposed Site Plans

Report Author Ryan Killeen