

**Residential Development
5 Rainsough Brow
Prestwich**

Planning Statement
on behalf of Rainsough Property Ltd

March 2023



Residential Development 5 Rainsough Brow Prestwich

Planning Statement on behalf of Rainsough Property Ltd

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Development Proposals	2
3. Effect on the Green Belt	3
4. Conclusions	8

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Planning Statement has been prepared by Plan A (North West) Limited on behalf of Rainsough Property Limited (the Applicant) in support of a planning application proposing to vary an extant planning approval to erect four detached dwellings at no.5 Rainsough Brow in Prestwich. The proposed variation seeks consent to amend the approved drawings to provide a single garage at each dwelling.
 - 1.2. This Statement sets out the merits of the proposed development in accordance with national and local planning policy guidance, taking account of all relevant material considerations.
 - 1.3. This Statement adopts the following structure:
 - Section 2: description of the application site and details of the proposed development;
 - Section 3: assessment of the effect of the proposal on the Green Belt; and
 - Section 4: conclusions.
-

2. Development Proposals

Application Site

- 2.1. The application site extends to 0.2ha and comprises a single residential dwelling with associated ancillary domestic buildings. The existing dwelling is set within a large plot that is surrounded by mature trees beyond the site boundary. A drive way leads from Rainsough Brow to the application site.
- 2.2. To the north, neighbouring uses comprise an open space corridor and a cemetery beyond, with a local convenience store located to the south across Rainsough Brow. A dwelling is located to the west and the site of former dwellings and an infant school to the east. Beyond the immediate neighbours, the surrounding areas to the north, west and south are primarily residential in character. Open space along the River Irwell corridor is located to the west, albeit this area accommodates a range of built developments, to include HMP Forest Bank.
- 2.3. Rainsough Brow provides a direct vehicular access to the site and linkages to the local and national highway network. Local bus routes pass along Rainsough Brow and nearby Kersal Road, with bus stops being located within 400m walking distance of the application site. The local transport network provides access to local shopping facilities, centres of employment and community facilities in Prestwich, Swinton, Salford, Manchester and beyond.

Approved Development

- 2.4. Full planning permission was granted on 25 September 2020 under reference 65170 for the demolition of the existing dwelling and associated outbuildings to allow the erection of four detached dwellings, with each dwelling being served by two off-street parking spaces and private amenity space. The dwellings are accessed via the existing driveway from Rainsough Brow, which will be widened to allow two vehicles to pass and the provision of a footway.

Proposed Development

- 2.5. It is hereby proposed to revise the approved drawings to provide for a single garage at each dwelling. The garage will be attached to the side of each dwelling and will have a pitched roof to match the design and appearance of the dwelling.
-

3. Effect on the Green Belt

- 3.1. The application site is located in the Green Belt and, therefore, the primary matter for consideration is whether the addition of the proposed garages is acceptable when assessed against the requirements of Green Belt policy. Accordingly, an appropriate assessment is presented below.
- 3.2. Bury UDP Policy OL1, which has regard to development within the Green Belt, was adopted in 1999 and is based upon national guidance that has since been superseded. It is, therefore, considered appropriate to assess the proposals against up-to-date national Green Belt Policy, as set out at chapter 13 of the NPPF.

Openness of Green Belt

- 3.3. The Applicant proposes to redevelop the application site in accordance with part g) of NPPF paragraph 149 by redeveloping the site in a manner that does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. This approach has been accepted by the Council in the context of the approved application.
- 3.4. The key matter for consideration is now whether the addition of the proposed single garages would result in an unacceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt when compared to the development that already has planning permission.
- 3.5. In an identical manner to the approved development, the Applicant's case attaches weight to what might otherwise be permitted to deliver on the site, but without having to specifically secure planning consent and/or build-out the full extensions or Permitted Development.

Extension of Existing Buildings

- 3.6. The application site currently accommodates a single existing dwelling together with its associated outbuildings. Excluding the more recent additions, the volume of the original dwelling (538m³) and outbuildings (263m³) amounts to 801m³.
- 3.7. The Council has adopted supplementary planning guidance on the re-use of existing buildings within the Green Belt (Development Control Policy Guidance Note 9: January 2007). Paragraph 5.11 advises that '*the Council may allow an extension to be up to a third of the volume of the original dwelling*'.
- 3.8. Therefore, following the guidance stated in DCPGN9, the original buildings on the application site could be extended by 33% in an appropriate manner that is compliant with part c) of paragraph 149 of the NPPF. The extension of the original buildings by 33%, therefore, has the potential to deliver buildings with a total volume of 1,064m³ on the site.

Permitted Development Rights

- 3.9. Permitted Development rights enable the Applicant to deliver additional ancillary domestic buildings within the curtilage of the existing dwelling in accordance with Class E of Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended).
 - 3.10. This guidance permits the erection of ancillary buildings provided that they accord with a number of limitations in terms of their dimensions, position in relation to the existing dwelling and site boundaries and the overall floorspace that they cover. There are no restrictions or prohibitions on Permitted Development on sites located within the Green Belt.
-

- 3.11. The Applicant, therefore, has the ability to erect a number of ancillary domestic buildings within the curtilage of the existing dwelling, which is illustrated by drawing reference R-0541-05 Rev C. Overall, there is potential to erect ancillary buildings with a total volume of 2,022m³ under Permitted Development rights within the application site without any conflict with Green Belt policy.

Redevelopment of the Site

- 3.12. In accordance with part g) of paragraph 149 of the NPPF, buildings and sites within the Green Belt may be redeveloped in an appropriate manner provided that the new development does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing.
- 3.13. It has been demonstrated above that the original buildings could be extended and ancillary buildings erected to achieve a total building volume of 3,086m³ (i.e. 1,064m³ plus 2,022m³). Accordingly, it is necessary to consider whether the four approved detached dwellings and the four proposed garages might result in a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt when compared to this achievable building volume.
- 3.14. Each of the approved dwellings will have a building volume of 581m³, with the previously approved scheme as a whole permitting a development of 2,324m³. The proposed single garages will each have a volume of 99m³. The proposals, therefore, seek consent for a total building volume of 2,720m³ (i.e. 2,324m³ plus 396m³), which is -366m³ below that which might otherwise be delivered on site through extensions and Permitted Development.
- 3.15. In order to satisfy part g) of NPPF paragraph 149, proposals to completely redevelop a site must not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing. National Planning Practice Guidance advises that the impact on the openness of the Green Belt should be assessed in terms of spatial and visual openness.
- 3.16. With regard to the spatial openness of the Green Belt, the application site comprises previously developed land that is bounded by other built development and previously developed land. Therefore, whilst located within the Green Belt, the site accommodates existing buildings that serve to reduce the openness of the Green Belt.
- 3.17. The Council has approved the redevelopment of the site to accommodate four buildings. This will not change as a result of the proposal, with each garage being attached to the host dwelling. The addition of the garages will not, therefore, have an unacceptable impact on the spatial openness of the Green Belt. Its impact will be neutral.
- 3.18. Turning to the visual openness of the Green Belt, the application site is set back from the road and is not widely visible in the immediate or surrounding area. This is assisted by the position of the site set into the slope, which assists in assimilating the proposed buildings into the landscape setting.
- 3.19. In addition, the site is surrounded by extensive mature tree cover that extends into the neighbouring Drinkwater Park and River Irwell corridor. This results in the site not being visible to public view and also in a very limited, if negligible, impact on the openness. Indeed, the character of the Green Belt in this location is not open, with the application site being located within a section of Green Belt that extends into the urban area, with built development being generally located to all sides of the site.
- 3.20. The Council has previously concluded that the four approved dwellings will not visually harm the openness of the Green Belt. The addition of the garages will not alter this. None of the garages will be visible from outside the application site. When the garages are seen within the application site, they will be seen in the context of the host dwelling, with which they will be visually appropriate given their ancillary residential nature and complimentary design. The addition of the garages will not prejudice the visual openness of the Green Belt.
-

Conclusion

- 3.21. Not all development within the Green Belt is inappropriate. The NPPF identifies a number of exceptions, to include the extension, replacement and redevelopment of existing buildings that are not inherently inappropriate in principle. It is also a matter of fact that the GPDO does not automatically remove Permitted Development rights within the Green Belt.
- 3.22. Therefore, there is potential to extend the existing dwelling and deliver ancillary accommodation to deliver a building(s) of greater volume than the site currently accommodates without any breach of Green Belt policy.
- 3.23. Furthermore, there is potential to deliver a replacement building that is 33% larger than what might be delivered following extensions and through Permitted Development rights, with additional potential to comprehensively redevelop the site to deliver a building or buildings of even greater volume. This potential is summarised by the following table.

	Building Volume
Original dwelling and outbuildings	801m ³
Extend original dwelling by 33%	+ 263m ³
Erect ancillary buildings as Permitted Development	+ 2,022m ³
Original Buildings + Extensions + PD Volume	3,086m³
Approved Dwellings Volume	2,324m ³
Proposed Garage Volume	396m ³
Total Proposed Volume	2,720m³
Proposed Difference	-366m³

- 3.24. On this basis, it is evident that the proposed development will have a building volume - 366m³ below that which might otherwise be achieved through extensions and under Permitted Development Rights. The inclusion of the garages will not, therefore, result in an increase in the volume of the development scheme when compared to that which might otherwise be delivered on the site.
- 3.25. Furthermore, the Council has previously accepted that the erection of four dwellings on the site will not harm the openness of the Green Belt, with the site not being widely visible in the immediate or surrounding area, set into the slope, which assists in assimilating the proposed buildings into the landscape setting, and surrounded by extensive mature tree cover. The inclusion of the proposed garages will not adversely affect this spatial and visual setting and, therefore, will not result in any material change to the openness of the Green Belt.
- 3.26. Therefore, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 149 g), the impact of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt is not unacceptable. There is no clear reason to resist the proposed development as it does not conflict with Green Belt policy.

Purpose of Green Belt

- 3.27. NPPF paragraph 138 confirms that the Green Belt serves five purposes. The effect that the proposed development may have upon each of these purposes is assessed below.

Check Unrestricted Urban Sprawl

- 3.28. The proposed development relates to an existing building located on previously developed land within the Green Belt. The Council has previously accepted that the erection of four dwellings on the site will not create urban sprawl and will not prejudice the role of the Green Belt to check urban sprawl. The proposed revisions to the development scheme to provide for attached garages at each dwelling will not affect this conclusion.

Prevent Neighbouring Towns from Merging

- 3.29. The application site is located on the edge of the urban area comprising Rainsough Brow, southern Prestwich and Kersal and forms part of a gap between these former residential areas and Pendlebury to the west, which is located across the River Irwell corridor. The river corridor performs a key role in preventing the urban areas to the east and west of it from merging. The Council has previously concluded that the erection of four detached dwellings on the site will not close the gap between neighbouring towns. The proposed revisions to the development scheme to provide for attached garages at each dwelling will not affect this conclusion.

Safeguard Countryside from Encroachment

- 3.30. The application site is not located in, or adjacent to, an area that could be considered to comprise countryside. Instead, the application site is located in an area that is urbanised, with neighbouring uses including other dwellings, previously developed land, a convenience store and a cemetery. The Council has previously concluded that the erection of four detached dwellings on the site will not result in any encroachment into the countryside, and the same conclusion can be drawn with respect of the proposed development.

Preserve Setting and Special Character of Historic Towns

- 3.31. The proposed development would not prejudice the setting or special character of any historic town. Indeed, there are no historic towns within the immediate locality or wider area that the proposal has potential, in principle, to impact upon.

Assist Urban Regeneration by Encouraging Recycling of Urban Land

- 3.32. The Council has previously accepted that the erection of four dwellings on the application site will assist urban regeneration, and this objective will continue to be supported by the revised proposals.

Conclusion

- 3.33. The application site comprises an existing dwelling located amongst other existing and historic buildings and previously developed land within the Green Belt, which are surrounded by urban areas. The Council has previously concluded that the erection of four detached dwellings on the site does not conflict individually or cumulatively with the five purposes of the Green Belt, and the same conclusion can be drawn with regard to this revised scheme to include a single attached garage at each of the approved dwellings. The Green Belt will continue to serve its purpose and there is, therefore, no clear reason to resist the proposed development on this basis.

Very Special Circumstances

- 3.34. NPPF Paragraph 149(g) supports the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt if the proposal comprises the complete redevelopment of previously-developed land and the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt when compared to the existing development on site.
- 3.35. NPPF Paragraph 148 advises that harm to the Green Belt may be outweighed by 'very
-

special circumstances', whereby the harm to the Green Belt is outweighed by other considerations.

- 3.36. In this context, the proposed development will result in -366m³ less building volume when compared to that which might otherwise be delivered through the extension of the existing dwelling and erection of other buildings using Permitted Development rights. The proposal must, therefore, be acceptable in this regard.
 - 3.37. Furthermore, the Council has previously approved the redevelopment of the site to accommodate four detached dwellings, accepting that the proposals did not result in an unacceptable impact of the openness of the Green Belt. The Council accepted that site specific characteristics of the application site offered a unique set of circumstances upon which the impact of the proposed additional building volume upon the openness of the Green Belt could be assessed.
 - 3.38. The Council accepted that the application site is set back from the road and is not widely visible in the immediate or surrounding area. This is assisted by the position of the site set into the slope, which assists in assimilating the proposed buildings into the landscape setting. In addition, the site is surrounded by extensive mature tree cover that extends into the neighbouring Drinkwater Park and River Irwell corridor. This results in the site not being visible to public view and also in a very limited, if negligible, impact on the openness. Indeed, the character of the Green Belt in this location is not open, with the application site being located within a section of Green Belt that extends into the urban area, with built development being generally located to all sides of the site.
 - 3.39. The difference in the impact upon the openness of the Green Belt resulting from the approved development and the revised scheme hereby proposed is negligible.
 - 3.40. '*Very Special Circumstances*', therefore, indicate that the proposal can be supported in accordance with Green Belt policy.
-

4. Conclusions

- 4.1. The application site comprises previously-developed land located within the Green Belt off Rainsough Brow in south Prestwich. The site currently accommodates an existing dwelling and ancillary buildings.
 - 4.2. Planning permission was granted in September 2020 for the demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings and the erection of four detached dwellings. In granting consent, the Council accepted that the proposals raised no conflict with Green Belt policy.
 - 4.3. It is now proposed to revise the approved scheme to provide for a single garage to be attached to each dwelling.
 - 4.4. The Applicant has presented a case that demonstrates how the proposed development fully accords with the requirements of Green Belt policy. It is demonstrated that there is potential to deliver a development as Permitted Development that has a greater total building volume to that hereby proposed.
 - 4.5. It has been demonstrated that the provision of the garages will not have a greater impact on the spatial or visual openness of the Green Belt when compared to the approved four-dwelling development. Indeed, the impact resulting from the inclusion of the garages will be negligible.
 - 4.6. It has also been demonstrated that the proposal will not prejudice any of the five purposes of the Green Belt.
 - 4.7. The Applicant has also demonstrated '*very special circumstances*' to allow the limited additional building volume proposed.
 - 4.8. There is, therefore, no reason to resist the proposed development as a result of its Green Belt location. It is appropriate development in the Green Belt that the NPPF offers support to.
 - 4.9. The proposed development, therefore, satisfies the requirements of the Development Plan policy and national guidance. As a result, the Local Planning Authority should adopt a positive and constructive approach towards the proposal and seek to grant planning permission without delay.
-