

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Helen Leach	Date of report: 03/10/2025	Ref: 72260/PIP
Registration: 29/08/2025	LDFC: 24/09/2025	Expiry Date: 03/10/2025
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 17	Con Area:	Adv Type: NONE
Reason for Delay:		EIA: NA
N/A		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Application for permission in principle for erection of up to 4 no. dwellings

Location: Hilsden Farm Stables, Ringley Road West, Radcliffe, M26 1DW

Description

The application site is located to the south of Ringley Road West, which is in use as a stables. There are a series of buildings (4) on site, which vary in terms of construction with some being permanent structures and some are temporary. To the east of the buildings is a riding arena.

There are green fields surrounding the site and there are residential properties to the north west of the site.

The applicant seeks a Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for up to 4 no. dwellings.

A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing-led development which separately assesses the consideration of principle for proposed development 'Stage 1', from the technical detail of the development 'Stage 2'.

This application relates to the Stage 1 of the process, to establish the principle aspect of the development for residential on this site.

The submission of a valid PiP application requires a completed application form, plan which identifies the land to which the application relates and the correct fee. There are no other details or reports which are required for the submission of a PiP. The application does include a Planning Statement.

A decision must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan and material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework.

To assess PiP applications, an Local Planning Authority's (LPAs) consideration is limited to location, land use and amount of development, with other matters considered at technical details stage.

Local Planning Authorities consult anybody that would be required to be consulted in relation to an application for planning permission but matters relating to ecology, landscaping, contamination, design, transport/highways and heritage are considered in a Stage 2 Technical Details application. Any responses received can be included as informative notes to advise the applicant of the requirements at a technical details stage.

Conditions cannot be attached to a PiP.

Relevant Planning History

38906 - Alpaca llama farm with farmhouse, second dwelling and barn at Hilsden Farm, Ringley Road West, Radcliffe. Refused - 28 March 2002.

Publicity

The neighbouring properties were notified by means of a letter on 2 September 2025.

16 letters have been received, which have raised the following issues:

- I object to any building being built, on a beautiful greenbelt lan.
- My daughter lives nearby & as a family we have lots of gatherings with stunning views, so please don't let it be spoilt.
- The development would result in the permanent loss of open green space and valued views currently enjoyed by local residents.
- The rural and natural character of the area would be replaced with buildings out of keeping with their surroundings
- This land is green belt and not grey belt. The loss of open land would strain the already stretched local infrastructure. There would be substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
- The proposed plans would lead to loss of natural habitat for wild deer, birds of prey, protected species and badgers.
- There are stunning unspoiled views of the Green Belt from my property and the new development will totally dominate the immediate view from my property. This will have a negative impact on me and my mental health.
- The proposals will have a loss of privacy on nearby residents.
- The noise generated by vehicles entering and leaving the development would create noise disturbance for existing residents.
- Noise during construction would create disturbance and risk destroying habitat and impact upon residents who work from home.
- Increased traffic and air pollution by increased traffic.
- Increased parking in an area where there is limited parking.
- The visibility on the access is poor and Ringley Road West is extremely busy currently.
- The previous owner of the above had permission for 1 dwelling, the remaining land is classed as Green Belt. "Green Belt is a planning designation to control development and stop urban areas from spreading into the countryside."
- There are no details available to view as to determine what type of dwellings are to be erected.
- The access road would be next to our property, which would impact upon our standard of living and mental health.
- Our buildings are stables and sheds. When can you knock a shed down and build a house on Green Belt land?
- The proposal would be the start of the applicant as they wish to build on all the land.
- The impact upon the main access road, security and valuation of our property should be taken into consideration.
- Application is too vague. Previous similar applications in this area have been rejected and refused by the authority and statutory consultees.
- Approving this application would set a damaging precedent for future developments and undermine the purpose of the Green Belt
- There are concerns about the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists, particularly during peak hours. It is essential that any planning permission takes into account the severe impact on local roads and infrastructure.
- There is a mains water pipe running at a location on the site, which could pose significant challenges for construction and future maintenance.
- The proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- The construction of houses would create urban sprawl and permanently erode the natural separation between nearby settlements.
- There are suitable brownfield sites in the area that could accommodate this development.
- The proposal will set a precedent for further development and brownfield sites should be developed first.
- A similar application opposite has been refused due to the perceived traffic congestion on an already busy stretch of road.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No objections in principle.

Drainage Section - No objections in principle

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objections in principle.

Waste Management - No response.

GM Ecology Unit - No objection in principle.

United Utilities - No objection in principle.

Policy - Object - the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would not make efficient use of the land.

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant.

Development Plan and Policies

H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G7	Trees and Woodland
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP9/7	PfE Policy
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), together with other relevant material planning considerations.

The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP and PfE Policies will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant

protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Principle - The Permission in Principle (PiP) application seeks to establish whether in principle, the site is suitable for a residential development for up to 4 dwellings. Consideration of PiP applications are limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters are considered at technical details stage.

Consultations on the planning application can be carried out but conditions cannot be attached to a PiP approval.

The issues to establish acceptance of the proposed PiP development are analysed below.

Land use and location

GREEN BELT - The application site falls within the Green Belt as designated by PfE Policy JP-G9 and as a result any development on the site is subject to NPPF Paragraph 154 and 155.

Paragraph 153 states 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.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF is clear that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt unless one of the listed exceptions apply.

Whilst the development of the site could be partially acceptable under 154 (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. However, in this case, a significant portion of the site is not previously developed and comprises only temporary structures. Therefore, the proposed development does not meet any exceptions listed within paragraph 154.

Paragraph 155 states that the development of homes should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:

The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;

There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;

The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF; and

Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.

Grey belt is defined by the NPPF as "land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development."

The application site does not impact assets referred to in footnote 7 and as considered above, a small fraction of the site comprises previously developed land. As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to the following purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

Planning guidance published on 27 February 2025 for assessing a site against these purposes is relevant to determine whether the land constitutes grey belt for decision making. In particular, paragraph 005 of the guidance sets out the key considerations to inform judgements as to whether land is grey belt (Reference ID: 64-005-20250225). As such, the site's contribution to these purposes is considered below.

Purpose (a) - unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - The site is located within a key part of the Green Belt between Bury and Salford, near to the built-up area of Radcliffe. The development of the site would result in an extended finger of development into a key part of the Green Belt and does not have any physical features that could restrict and contain development, nor is it partially enclosed by existing development. Whilst there are some urbanizing features, there is generally a sense of openness relating to the farmed landscape in this location.

As such, it is considered that the development would result in an incongruous pattern of development to the south of Ringley Road West and that it contributes strongly to this purpose. This is supported by the assessment of the wider parcel BU-BA46 in the Greater Manchester Green Belt Assessment (2018) which found that it plays a strong role in inhibiting ribbon development south of the A667 and along protruding minor internal access roads.

Purpose (b) - Prevent neighboring towns merging - The guidance specifies this is in reference to the merging of towns, not villages. At just 0.48ha, the site does not form a substantial gap between any towns. The site would be able to be developed without any significant impact on the visual separation of towns. As such it is considered that the site makes a weak contribution toward purpose (b).

Green Belt conclusion - As the site makes a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose (a) and therefore does not fall within the definition of Grey Belt Land.

In conclusion, the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances (VSC). No VSC have been provided which clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and therefore the principle of development is unacceptable.

PRINCIPLE - RESIDENTIAL - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions, and emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, with either a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, or a 20% buffer where there has been significant undelivery of housing over the previous three years. As set out in NPPF paragraph 78, the supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies where these are less than five years old.

The joint Places for Everyone Plan was adopted with effect from 21 March 2024 and sets the up-to-date housing requirement for Bury against which the deliverable supply of housing land must be assessed. PfE Policy JP-H1 sets the following stepped targets for Bury:

- 246 homes per year from 2022-2025;
- 452 homes per year from 2025-2030; then
- 520 homes per year from 2030-2039.

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out the latest housing supply position, which is made up of sites that have an extant planning permission and sites that have potential to obtain planning permission in the future. This shows that there are a number of sites within the Borough with the potential to deliver a significant amount of housing. However, not all of these sites will contribute to the deliverable land supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed. The joint Places for Everyone Plan allocates significant strategic sites for housing within Bury and will accelerate housing delivery within the Borough to meet housing needs.

Following the adoption of Places for Everyone, the Council is able to demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land with a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement.

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government (the 2023 measurement published on 12 December 2024) show that Bury has a HDT result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

Therefore, paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless:

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

As a result of the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply. In this case, the site is located within the Green Belt so therefore paragraph 11 (d)(i) applies and the proposal needs to be assessed against Green Belt policies. The latest published HDT result for Bury also means that NPPF paragraph 155b is triggered, and there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

NPPF paragraph 80 requires the latest published HDT results to be used. However, the Government is currently operating to a delayed publication timetable for the HDT, and although the latest published results for 2023 are below 75%, based on the current HDT rulebook Bury's result for 2024 will be above 75% and the tilted balance will no longer be triggered by the housing delivery test result.

The site is within the Green Belt, and in order to be considered not inappropriate development, the development will need to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 155 and the Golden Rules set out in paragraph 156-157. As set out above, the site is not considered to be Grey Belt, and therefore does not comply with NPPF paragraph 155, and very special circumstances would be required.

Efficient use of land - PfE Policy JP-H4 - Requires new housing development to be delivered at a density appropriate to the location, reflecting the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land and high-quality design. Policy JP-H4 sets out minimum densities that should be considered. The site falls in an area where a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare applies.

The total site area is circa 0.48 hectares, therefore 4 dwellings equates to 8.3 dwellings per hectare. 35 dwellings per hectare equates to 17 dwellings. The site area excluding the access road is circa 0.4 hectares, so even if this is excluded from the developable area, the site would need to deliver 14 dwellings to achieve a density of 35 dwellings per hectare.

The site therefore fails to meet the PfE density requirements set out in policy JP-H4.

The policy allows for lower densities where they can be clearly justified by:

1. Local housing market issues, such as a demonstrable need for a particular type of housing that cannot be delivered at a higher density; or
2. Site-specific issues, such as the design context and any potential impact on the wider landscape or townscape including heritage assets and green infrastructure.

The site's Green Belt location would not automatically justify a lower density, and the applicant's planning statement doesn't provide a clear justification for a lower density. Developing the site for up to 4 dwellings would therefore be contrary to JP-H4 and NPPF paragraph 130 which expects development to make efficient use of land.

Conclusion - As the site makes a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose (a) and therefore does not fall within the definition of Grey Belt Land. As such, the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and should not be approved except in Very Special Circumstances (VSC). No VSC have been provided which clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and therefore the principle of development is unacceptable.

In addition, the proposed development of 4 dwellings would not make efficient use of the land and would conflict with Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan.

Consultee responses

Highways

It is possible that traffic management requirements could be satisfied for this development

but details have not been pursued because it is understood that the proposal is to be recommended for refusal on planning grounds.

Drainage

Should this proposal be approved, and a further application submitted for Technical Detail Consent, it is important to note that our response to a subsequent application will be based upon the information that is available at the time of response, and therefore, our position and advice may vary.

We strongly recommend that the applicant or any subsequent developer contacts United Utilities, using our pre-development enquiry service to discuss their proposals directly with our Developer Services team. They can find further advice, along with a pre-development enquiry form, on our website: Building & Developing - United Utilities. Alternative ways to contact the team are available in the Appendix, Section 5.0 'Contacts'.

DRAINAGE - Directed by the principles set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance and the new National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (2025) we require developers and Local Planning Authorities, to do all that they can to avoid surface water entering the public sewer, unless absolutely necessary. This applies to all proposed development. See Appendix 1.1 'Surface Water Hierarchy'.

All options for the sustainable management of surface water must be thoroughly investigated before we will accept any surface water connections from new development to the public sewer. Where a new surface water connection to the public sewer is proposed, we will require robust evidence to demonstrate the drainage hierarchy has been fully investigated and there are no more sustainable options available for the management of surface water.

Should the applicant receive Planning in Principle permission for this proposal, United Utilities will review the drainage element of any application for Technical Detail Consent in line with comments made above.

To discuss their drainage proposals the applicant should contact our Developer Services team by email at SewerAdoptions@uuplc.co.uk. Alternative ways to contact the team are detailed in the Appendix, Section 5.0 'Contacts'.

When considering their drainage proposal, it is the applicant's responsibility to investigate the existence of any infrastructure that might impact their detailed design. This includes water, wastewater, operational and/or abandoned pipelines. United Utilities will not routinely carry out this assessment when reviewing drainage proposals submitted within a planning application. Where infrastructure exists, the drainage design must comply with the relevant United Utilities guidelines and/or Building Regulations. Further information is available on our website: Working near our pipes - United Utilities. Failure to consider existing infrastructure when designing a drainage proposal may result in the applicant having to redesign proposals at a later date.

UNITED UTILITIES' PROPERTY, ASSETS AND INFRASTRUCTURE - Water main - A strategic large diameter trunk main crosses the access road to this site. It must not be built over, or our access to the pipeline compromised in any way. We require an access strip as detailed in our 'Standard Conditions for Works Adjacent to Pipelines', which can be found on our website:
<https://www.unitedutilities.com/builders-developers/your-development/planning/building-over-or-working-near-our-assets/working-near-our-pipes/>.

The applicant must comply with this document to ensure pipelines are adequately protected both during and after the construction period.

Based on the information currently available, it is unclear whether sufficient distance will be

provided between the proposed development features and our water asset.

The acceptability of any proposal is dependent upon the applicant knowing the exact location (line and depth) of the asset in question, confirmed through their site specific investigations. The precise location of United Utilities assets is critical as this could be material to the detail of the final site design; including any proposed crossings of the asset with either above or below ground features (including utility services). Should permission in principle be granted, future applications should provide a detailed site plan which overlays the proven location of our large diameter trunk main and associated easement in relation to any proposed development (including walls, fencing, parking etc). In this scenario we will require evidence to show that the location of the pipeline has been confirmed by site-specific survey. A copy of the asset maps will not suffice.

Should permission in principle be granted, and future full or technical details consent applications be submitted, we are likely to request that the below condition is included on any subsequent decision notices;

Condition - No construction shall commence until details of the means of ensuring the water main that is laid within the site boundary is protected from damage as a result of the development have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The details shall outline the potential impacts on the water main from construction activities and the impacts post completion of the development on the water main infrastructure that crosses the site and identify mitigation measures to protect and prevent any damage to the water main both during construction and post completion of the development. Any mitigation measures shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of public health and to ensure protection of the public water supply. Given the size and nature of the pipeline concerned, we strongly recommend that if they have not already done so, the applicant contacts our Water Developer Services team at the earliest opportunity for advice on determining the precise location of the pipeline and additional protection measures they must consider both during and after construction.

It is the applicant's responsibility to investigate the existence of any pipelines that might cross or impact their proposed site and also to demonstrate the exact relationship between United Utilities' assets and the proposed development. The applicant should not rely solely on the detail contained within asset maps when considering a proposed layout.

It is important that the supporting information contained in the Appendix, Section 2.0 'United Utilities' Property, Assets and Infrastructure', is read in conjunction with this letter. This provides information that might impact a proposed layout and additional guidance that an applicant or developer must consider when United Utilities assets are located in, or in the locality of, the proposed site.

Where United Utilities' assets exist, it is essential that the applicant, or any subsequent developer, contacts our Developer Services team prior to commencing any works on site, including trial holes, groundworks or demolition. See Appendix, Section 5.0 'Contacts'.

WATER EFFICIENCY IN NEW DEVELOPMENT - All new homes are required to meet the mandatory national standard of 125 litres of water used per person per day (l/p/d) as set out in Building Regulations Approved Document G. If your adopted development plan includes a policy that implements the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 l/p/d for new-build dwellings in Part 3 of Building Regulations, you should ensure that this is a condition of any planning permission you may grant. You should also consider whether there is any adopted development plan policy relating to water efficiency in the construction of non-residential development. As this is a matter for the local planning authority/ building control body, United Utilities would not be involved in the discharge of conditions relating to water efficiency.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land

The site is currently in use as a livery and comprises a cluster of buildings (including a barn) used for stabling for horses, associated containers used for ancillary storage, and a riding arena as such there is the potential for contamination to be present. Furthermore, a sensitive end use is proposed. As such, to avoid pre-commencement conditions sufficient information must be submitted at Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, to demonstrate that no remedial measures are required or to agree such measures. Given that demolition is proposed as part of this application and will also need to be completed before (final) site investigation works are carried out it is not clear at this stage how this will be achieved. Further information regarding Land Contamination and the planning process can be found in Bury Council's Developers Guide and on the Planning Portal. This Section can also be contacted directly to discuss.

Air Quality

For this type of development, it would be expected that parking would be included. The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Due to the scale of the proposed development, it is considered very unlikely that the proposed development could create an increase of more than 500 AADT (annual average daily traffic). Therefore, in line with the EPUK Guidance, an air quality assessment will not be required.

Bury Council has been identified by DEFRA as an area requiring to significantly improve air quality. To support the principles of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan in reducing levels of nitrogen dioxide and in order to manage current and future levels of air pollution Bury Council is encouraging the use of cleaner vehicles. As such and in line the requirements of the Building Regulations (The Building Regulations 2010, Approved Document S, Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles), as part of the Stage 2, Technical Details Consent stage, the developer should provide information regarding Electric Vehicle Infrastructure to the following specification:

- 1 no. electric vehicle (EV) charging point (minimum 7kW*) per dwelling/parking space.

*Mode 3, 7kW (32A) single phase, or 22kW (32A) three phase, and for 50kW Mode 4 rapid charging may be required. British Standard BS EN 61851-1:2019 to be used.

Further information regarding minimum standards can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/transport/low-emission-and-electric-vehicles>.

Certification and photographic evidence of the installation of the agreed electric vehicle charge points will be required to be submitted to Local Planning Authority for approval prior to the development being brought into use. The infrastructure shall be maintained and operational in perpetuity.

Ecology

In principle, there are no current ecological reasons for the development not to proceed to a full application. Some of the likely considerations at full application stage are covered below.

Bats - Looking at the buildings, there is negligible potential for them to support roosting bats. The full application will need a preliminary ecological assessment (PEA). I would have the applicants ecologist carry out a preliminary roost assessment to confirm that the buildings and any trees on site, have negligible potential to support roosting bats.

Nesting birds - The barns may support nesting and roosting birds such as swifts, swallows and barn owls. The PEA will need to check for nesting birds and make appropriate recommendations at the time. GMEU will likely seek the provision of alternative nesting/roosting locations.

Method statements - The applicants ecologist may also recommend precautionary method statements for species such as mammals and amphibians.

Biodiversity - There will be a loss of habitat on site. A biodiversity net gain metric will need completing to assess the loss and mitigation provided, along with a 10% net gain or a general net gain, depending on the type of application that comes forward.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

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. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development site contributes strongly to Green Belt purpose (a) (unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas) and therefore, the proposed development would fail the tests set out in Paragraph 155 in relation to Grey Belt Land.
- 2 The proposed development for 4 No dwellings on a 0.48ha site would not make optimal use of the potential of the site. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and Chapter 11, particularly paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
HL - 03/10/2025			