

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/00463/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/00463/FUL

CASE OFFICER

Aimee Bovaird

DETERMINATION DATE 22.08.2024 EXT OF TIME 17.12.24

Address: Langley Lane Farm, Langley Lane Middleton Rochdale M24 5LJ

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and the erection of a replacement ancillary storage building.

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	N/A
	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?	Y

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

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

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT subject to conditions

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: LA

DATE: 17.12.24

SITE

The application site is Langley Lane Farm, the building this application relates to is a building in the centre of the wider farm, and the site is accessed off Langley Lane. The existing building consists of 12 stables and the lawful use is equestrian and is constructed largely from timber although is in a semi dilapidated condition. The majority of the site sits within the Green Belt and a small part sits within Protected Open Land. The farmhouse and associated barns on the site have been identified as non- designated heritage assets.

North and west of the site lies fields, east of the site is a housing development. South of the site lies further residential development. There are various agricultural buildings in the wider vicinity.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes demolition of the existing building and the erection of a replacement storage building. The existing building and surrounding lands lawful use is equestrian. The existing building consists of 12 stables and is 3.5m in height to the ridge, 11.45m in width and 20m long.

The new building will be used for storage for agricultural vehicles and machinery associated with Langley Lane Farm. , The footprint will be moved south and east from the existing building. The proposed building will be 4.5m to the ridge and 2.6m to the eaves. The proposed materials will consist of Fairfaced reclaimed brick plinth for the walls, metal profile roof and timber.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

JP-P9 Green Belt

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Local

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO2 - To create successful and healthy communities

C1 - Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places

C3 - Delivering the right type of housing

SO3 - To improve design, image and quality of place

P2 - Protecting and enhancing character, landscape and heritage

P3 - Improving design of new development

SO4 - Promoting a greener environment

G6 - Enhancing green infrastructure
G7 - Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

SO5- To improve accessibility and deliver sustainable transport

T2 - Improving accessibility
DM1 - General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

D/10 – Protected Open Land

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

23/00672/CPE - Certificate of lawfulness for the existing use of land and buildings at Langley Lane Farm is equestrian – Approved

24/00464/FUL - Alteration of existing dwelling together with conversion and alteration of adjoining barn to form additional accommodation. – Undetermined

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Highways And Engineering

No comments received to date

Env Health - Noise/Odours

No objections

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No comments received to date

Conservation

No objections subject to amends.

REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification have been sent to surrounding neighbours. One objection has been received raised concerns over the proposed development allowing large vehicles to enter the site. They have raised this will result in increased pressure on the roads and increased noise.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The majority of the site is designated Green Belt and a small portion is designated as Protected Open Land. The National Planning Policy Framework, 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'.

Policy G5 in Rochdale's Core Strategy should be read in conjunction with Policy D/10 set out in Rochdale's Unitary Development Plan. Paragraph 153 requires, 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.'

The application is for the demolition of the existing building and to build a replacement building used for agricultural storage. Paragraph 154 sets out that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it meets one or more of a list of exceptions

In this instance the applicant is presenting the point that this application meets exception (g) 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.' The site is previously developed land, and therefore it is relevant to then assess whether the redevelopment would cause substantial harm to openness.

The proposed development is larger than the existing building, the ridge height is increasing by 1m, the eaves are increasing by 1.1m, the width is increasing by 2.44m and the length is increasing by 1.6m. This all equates to a total volume increase of 91%.

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.

Spatial

In assessing the spatial aspect of the development, the replacement building is larger. The total volume increase of 91%. Therefore the overall footprint is larger, however the footprint is moving more out of the Green Belt and onto Protected Open Land. This replacement building increases in height from 3.5m to 4.5m, the eaves increase from 1.5m to 2.6m, the width increases from 11.4m to 13.8 and the length increases from 20.6m to 22.2m. The replacement building will be fundamentally larger however the majority of the increase will be in Protected Open Land. This is not considered to cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

In assessing the spatial harm caused by the development on the Green Belt openness, it is important to recognise that the absence of any significant visual

intrusion does not in itself mean that there is no impact on openness. The spatial openness of the Green Belt is clear around the building, the proposed development is introducing a replacement building. However as noted before the footprint is moving away from the Green Belt and there is not a greater impact on openness.

Visual

The application site is not isolated from the surrounding built environment. East of the site are residential developments and south is the highway. The application sits on the edge of the Green Belt, the impact on visual awareness would be more severe if the development was positioned further away from the boundary and residential dwellings.

The design of the proposed replacement building would fit in with a rural character, the materials would be timber planking, reclaimed brick and metal profile roofing. This is considered an improvement on the appearance of the building. The building would have some screening as it is set back from the highway. The development would be seen from the rear of residential dwellings set on higher ground nearby.

Overall, the development would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt and is not 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.

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.

Impact on Openness

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF sets out the 5 purposes of the Green Belt, one of which is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This approach is supported by PfE and by replacing the building with a larger structure, this will have a negative impact on the openness and conflicts with the NPPF.

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 site comprises land containing an existing building. This area of land also includes a residential dwelling and other farm buildings. The site has a sense of openness about it and the siting of the building has altered the visual and spatial aspects of openness in this location.

The development applied for however 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

The site is characterised by its rural and slightly urban environment with open fields to the north of the site and the highway and residential dwellings to the west. The proposed development would not have an impact on this purpose as the development is brought closer to the existing buildings rather than away from them into the countryside.

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.

Openness Conclusion

The development is not considered inappropriate development and is not therefore harmful by definition. The proposal would not conflict with the five purposes that the Green Belts serves.

In terms of harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt, the consideration of openness can involve various factors, relating to a proposal's site context, including the visual sensitivity within the landscape and appreciation of such development for example. Officers have therefore considered the proposal having regard to its individual merits, including its scale and site context the development would preserve the openness of the Green Belt as discussed above.

The development does not negatively impact upon both spatial and visual openness. In conclusion the development is acceptable in principle.

Other Harm

As set out in paragraph 153 of the NPPF, there is a need to assess whether any other harm would result from the proposed development.

Heritage

The building is identified as a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment, and where necessary a field evaluation.

NPPF paragraph 208 states that 'local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and the necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage assets conservation and any aspect of the proposal.'

A Heritage Assessment was submitted to accompany this application, the Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted and raised no objections subject amends to finishing materials which had been submitted within the application process.

Conclusion on other harm

In conclusion the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the non-designated heritage asset.

Other Considerations

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

Design/Visual Amenity

Policy P2 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will protect and enhance the Borough's character, including the quality of its countryside. New development is required to integrate successfully.

The replacement building is proposed to be finished in fairfaced reclaimed brick plinth, timber planking and metal profile roofing. The finishing materials are considered acceptable and an improvement on the existing building, in accordance with Policy P2.

Residential Amenity

Policies DM1 and G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy seek to ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents / users. Paragraph 135 also seeks to ensure that planning decisions create places which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The proposed development will be separated from residential dwellings by an existing complex of farm buildings, and so noise generated from the proposed development is not considered to be greater than existing. The proposed use of the building is to store agricultural equipment in connection with Langley Lane Farm and this is not considered to have a negative impact on residential amenity.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has been consulted and raised no objections to the application. It is not considered the proposed development would have a negative impact on residential amenity because the dwellings are a sufficient distance away from the development there will be no greater impact on noise.

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. Highways Services have raised no objections and with regard to CS Policies T1 and T2, Policy JP-C8 of PfE and the NPPF. Therefore neutral weight is attributed against the development in this regard.

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. Paragraphs 2 and 219 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that the policies contained therein are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications. 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.

The development would not negatively impact either spatially or visually upon openness and is considered acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to the following conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason. Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents
 - Existing stable and Proposed replacement building 2300/L21-200 Rev E
 - Site Plan replacement building 2286/L1-101
 - Planning Statement
 - Dusk Emergence Survey by Angela Graham Bat Consultancy Service

and the development shall be carried out in complete accordance with these drawings hereby approved unless otherwise required by the conditions below.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory standard of development in accordance with the policies contained within the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The development shall be constructed using the external facing materials, detailed on the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in compliance with policies P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The development hereby approved shall be used for the storage of agricultural equipment in connection with Langley Lane Farm. No other equipment shall be stored on the site and the building shall not be used for any other trade or business.

Reason: Having regard to its Green Belt location and in the interests of residential amenity and in compliance with policies P3, G9 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

The proposal complies with the development plan and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. It therefore comprises sustainable development and the Local Planning Authority worked proactively to issue the decision without delay.

Report Author Aimee Bovaird