

PLANNING STATEMENT



Site address:

**Home Barn, Meadowcroft Farm,
Lowercroft Road,
Walshaw,
Bury, BL8 3PD**

Proposal:

**Conversion of an existing agricultural building into
dwelling with single-storey extension and associated
access.**

Contents

1. Executive summary	3
2. The Proposal	5
3. Current Status	6
4. Context	7
Site location and Description	7
5. Relevant planning history	8
6. Previous Application Ref 67132 - Reasons for Refusal	9
6.1.Reasons for Refusal	9
6.2.Amendments to Address Reasons for Refusal	10
6.3.Encroachment on the Green Belt	10
6.4.Detrimental Impact on the Green Belt	11
6.5.Public Right of way	11
6.6.Public Right of way	12
6.7. Other Matters	13
7. Planning Policy Context National Planning Policy	16
8. The Development Plan	17
9. Planning Considerations	19
9.6.An acceptable form of development in the Green Belt	19
9.6.1.Re use of the existing building within the Green Belt	20
9.28. Extension or alteration of a building with the Green Belt	25
9.40.Sustainable Development	27
10. Summary and Conclusions	30

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. This Planning Statement accompanies a full application for planning permission for Conversion of an existing agricultural building into dwelling with single-storey extension and the upgrade of access track at land at Meadowcroft Farm, Lowercroft Road, Bury.

1.2. The application site comprises a detached agricultural building located within a rural setting and within an area designed as Green Belt.

1.3. The principle of a residential use on this site has already been established under extant consent application 65778 dated the 7th October 2020, which granted prior approval to convert the existing agricultural building into a dwelling.

1.4. The conversion and extension has been carefully designed to ensure the proposal retains the character of the existing building but will also provide significant visual improvements to this unused building.

1.5. This application seeks permission for the conversion of the existing building with a modest single storey side extension to provide an appropriate sized bedroom with accessible bathroom.

1.6. The proposals to convert and extend a structurally sound building that will not result in a disproportionate addition over or above the size of the original buildings and are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt are supported by policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and saved policies OL1/2 and Policy OL1/4 of the Bury UDP which relates to new and converted buildings.

1.7. This statement sets the above out in greater detail our client's proposals and validates how the development accords with both local and national planning policies.

Thomas England (North West) Limited
The Seed Barn
Drakelow Gorse Farm
Yatehouse Lane
Byley CW10 9NS



- i.8. This application also address the reasons for refusal of the previous application reference 67132.

2. THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1. The proposal seeks full planning permission for the conversion of an existing agricultural building to one dwelling house. It is proposed that a single storey addition will extend from the eastern elevation of the building to provide additional floorspace for a full second bedroom and accessible bathroom.
- 2.2. The existing building is constructed in slate and random stone and it is proposed to use similar materials to be in keeping and sympathetic with the character of the existing agricultural building.
- 2.3. The proposal includes the formalising of a vehicle access off the existing farm track as well as associated hard and soft landscaping. It is proposed the garden curtilage of the new dwelling will be delineated by a new post and rail fence.
- 2.4. This application is accompanied by a suite of plans which illustrate the scale, design and layout of the proposed dwelling.

3. CURRENT STATUS

- 3.1. **Planning Permission Reference Ref: 65778 has been implemented in part and a 'Material Start on Site' has been undertaken.**
- 3.2. The property is in the process of being renovated and converted.
- 3.3. As part of the conversion works, the homeowner has requested the property is brought up to above Building Regulations standards in terms of insulation values which has necessitated the installation of a new internal wall (leaf) and cavity plus the infill of insulation to all external walls.
- 3.4. The provision of the new internal leaf and insulation has reduced the net internal area and has resulted in the originally designed second bedroom being too small and unfit for purpose.
- 3.5. The homeowner has therefore requested an application be submitted for an extension to the building to form a full second bedroom with an accessible bathroom.

4. CONTEXT

SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 4.1. The site is located to the west of Bury in a rural location outside of the built-up area of Walshaw village.
- 4.2. The application site comprises a detached agricultural building which sited approx. 115m from the Meadowcroft Farm where planning permission has recently been granted for the farm buildings to be converted into dwellings. The property is surrounded by open countryside.
- 4.3. Meadowcroft Farm and the application site are served via an unadopted road which leads off Lowercroft Road and the Slaidburn Drive. It is this lane that the proposal would take direct access off.
- 4.4. Two Public rights of way BUR 136 and 138 runs directly to the east and south of the site.
- 4.5. Aside from the properties at Meadowcroft Farm, there are no other residential properties near to the application site.
- 4.6. The site is identified as forming part of the Greater Manchester Green Belt.
- 4.7. The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings within proximity of the site. There also no trees within the application site which would be impacted by the proposed development.
- 4.8. Being located within Flood Zone 1 the development is at low risk from flooding.

5. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

5.1. Relevant planning history is summarised in the table below.

69216	Single storey side extension	Withdrawn
67132	Change of use of an existing agricultural building, an extension, minor external alterations and the creation of a new access	Refused 15/12/2021
65778	Prior approval for change of use of an agricultural building to a dwelling house	Prior approval required and granted on 7/10/2020
64308	Conversion and extension of existing detached dwelling into 2 no. semi-detached dwellings; Conversion and extension of agricultural outbuildings	Approve with Conditions 09/10/2019
63382	Prior approval for the proposed change of use of an agricultural	Prior Approval Required

6. PREVIOUS APPLICATION REF 67132 - REASONS FOR REFUSAL

6.1. REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed extension would, by reason of its scale, size and position on the site, require land unnecessary to facilitate the development and would result in encroachment into the Green Belt, and thereby introduce unacceptable levels of domestication which would have a significant and harmful impact on the openness and special character of the Green Belt and the Special Landscape Area. There are no Very Special Circumstances demonstrated which would outweigh the harm which would be caused to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury UDP Policies EN1/1 - Visual Amenity, EN9/1 - Special Landscape Areas, OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt, OL1/4 - Conversion and Re-Use of Buildings in the Green Belt, and SPD 8 and SPD9 and the principles of the NPPF.

2 The proposed extensions, by virtue of the size, position, design and appearance would introduce a prominent, discordant, disproportionate and unsympathetic features to the existing building and the Green Belt and would have a significantly detrimental impact on the openness and character of the Green Belt and Special Landscape Area and as such would be inappropriate development. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury UDP Policies EN1/1 - Visual Amenity, EN9/1 - Special Landscape Areas, OL1/2 - New Buildings in the Green Belt, OL1/4 - Conversion and Re-Use of Buildings in the Green Belt, and SPD 8 and SPD9 and the principles of the NPPF.

3 The proposed access, by virtue of the works necessary to formalise the Public Right of Way No.136, Bury, would have a harmful and significant impact on the character and openness of the Green Belt and as such would be inappropriate development and contrary to Bury Unitary development Plan Policies EN1/1 - Visual Amenity, OL1/4 - Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and RT3/3 - Access to the Countryside and the principles of the NPPF.

4 The application and submitted plans contain insufficient information to ensure that Public Footpath No. 136, Bury would be accommodated in its entirety and that the legal line and

full width of the Public Right of Way No 136 Bury and No 138 Bury would remain accessible to the public on foot. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Bury Unitary Development Plan Policies EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design, OL1/4 - Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and RT3/3 - Access to the Countryside.

6.2.AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS REASONS FOR REFUSAL

6.2.1. This application has been substantially amended to address each of the reasons for refusal as follows:

6.3.ENCROACHMENT ON THE GREEN BELT

6.3.1. On the recommendation of the planning officer, the proposed extension has been repositioned to the eastern side of the existing barn whereby it is considered that its visual impact would be far less. It has been “tucked in” next to the existing building and its proposed form is subservient to the mass of the existing barn. The eastern elevation of the building is less exposed to views from the surrounding open countryside and therefore we consider that any perceived ‘encroachment’ into the green belt is far less.

6.3.2. Under the extant planning consent reference 65778 the curtilage for the approved development includes an area of land between the existing barn and the access track. It is already accepted that this would be required to access the building for residential use and therefore that there will be some ‘domestication’ of this area. This application seeks to increase this area only slightly in order to accommodate the extension and a small area of additional curtilage to enable access around the building and for building maintenance.

6.3.3. The repositioning of the extension and the re-design of the form of construction in our opinion would provide a building which would be more sensitive to its location and would be considered less harmful to the openness and character of the Green Belt.

6.4.DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON THE GREEN BELT

6.4.1. The proposed form and appearance of the extension has been redesigned completely to take on a much more subservient mass. The roof is proposed to be integrated with the existing barn roof and to form a traditional 'cat slide' arrangement as seen on traditional farm buildings within the area. The eaves of the extension would also be considerably lower than the eaves of the existing building. In addition the footprint of the extension has also been altered so it takes on a linear design so again would be more in keeping with the rectangular arrangement of the existing building. The proposed materials will match those of the existing building.

6.4.2. By changing the proposed footprint of the building, by integrating the roof into a traditional 'cat slide' roof and by providing a lower eaves height we are of the opinion that the appearance of the proposed extension would have far less perceived impact on the green belt. The change in footprint to a linear design means the proposed extension is smaller in scale to the previous proposal and the 'lean to design' adopted would provide an extension which is subsidiary to the original building.

6.5.PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY

6.5.1. The Public Right of way number 136 would be unaffected by the proposed development. The subject site is currently served by an

access track from the existing development at Meadowcroft Farm. The track has been described in the officers report as a grass track. It is however a stone track that has been overlaid for years with mud and grass from cows occupying the adjacent fields. The proposal would be to simply upgrade this track with a stone and gravel surface. The hedges and overhanging branches to adjacent trees have already been cut back by the owner of the adjoining fields who requires access down the track with farm machinery.

6.5.2. Access between pedestrians and vehicles is shared on the track from Slaidburn Drive to the Meadowcroft Farm development (some 650 m long). It is proposed that the track from Meadowcroft Farm to the subject site would also be shared. The 'status quo' would therefore be maintained.

6.5.3. Currently farm vehicles use the track to access the fields near to the reservoirs and this will have to be maintained in perpetuity as access rights over the track have been granted to the adjoining landowner. Therefore the legal line and full width of the Public Right of Way would remain accessible to the public on foot.

6.6.PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY

6.6.1. The planning officer has also commented within their report on the Public Right of way no. 138 which runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The right of way is defined by an existing stile immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary and this is in poor condition. It is proposed that it will be replaced with a new stile to match.

6.6.2. The width of this path is not recorded but looks to follow the eastern boundary of the site. Taking government guidance to the size of the public right of way the new extension has been designed so it will **not**

interfere with the right of way and will maintain sufficient space between the extension and the boundary for the public on foot.

Reference:

Public rights of way: landowner responsibilities - Source Gov Web site
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/public-rights-of-way-landowner-responsibilities#keep-public-rights-of-way-clear-of-obstructions>

You must not cultivate (eg plough) footpaths or bridleways that follow a field edge. The minimum width you need to keep undisturbed is: 1.5 metres for a field edge footpath.

6.6.3. The owner of the field to the north of the application site could plough the field up to the Public Right of way and maintain Government guidance leaving an area of 1.5m undisturbed following the boundary fence. Given the position of the existing stile which is immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary and the Government guidance above it would seem appropriate to suggest that the footpath follows the field edge for a distance of 1.5m. Therefore we are of the opinion that the proposed extension will not impact on the Public Right of way no. 138.

6.7. OTHER MATTERS

6.7.1. The following items were raised in the Planning Officer Report following consultates responses for Application 67132 and have been addressed as part of this application.

6.7.2. **Fire** - Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Services (GMFR) suggested a number of deficiencies with regard the access to the site and also a number of mitigating options that are available. We have taken on board the suggestions proposed by GMFR and have included them within the design.

- 6.7.3. A domestic sprinkler/mist system will be installed within the property similar to that provided at the adjacent Meadowcroft Farm development.
- 6.7.4. A comprehensive fire detection and alarm system will be installed and is proposed as part of this application.
- 6.7.5. The proposed occupant of the property has been informed and acknowledges that the location of the property could impact on GMFR attendance at an emergency.
- 6.7.6. It is also acknowledged that the risks identified by GMFR are disclosed to any new buyer of the property to ensure they are also aware of the access deficiencies.
- 6.7.7. GMFR state “*Ultimately the decision to approve or deny the application lies with Bury Planning Department*”. They are possibly not aware that the property already has planning consent for the conversion to residential use under application 65778. The principle of conversion to residential has already been set and by accommodating the suggestions made by GMFR we are of the opinion that their concerns can now be satisfied and the application can be approved.
- 6.7.8. In addition it should be noted that during the construction works of the adjacent Meadowcroft Farm, a fire was started by some youths at a weekend when the construction site was closed. A total of 5 Fire engines attended the fire and were on site within 5 minutes of the fire being reported. There was no issue with regard access.
- 6.7.9. **Curtilage** - Following comments made by the planning officer on the previous application the size of the site curtilage has been reduced from the size proposed previously.
- 6.7.10. There is no authoritative or precise definition of the term ‘curtilage’. However, what is relevant from previous case law is that the area should seem “*appropriate*” to the property and should serve the purpose of the building “*in a reasonable, necessary or useful manner*”.

6.7.11. It is noted that the proposed curtilage is larger than the planning consent under reference 65778. However, under the Prior Approval application the curtilage this was limited to:

“an area of land immediately beside or around the agricultural building no larger than the land area occupied by the agricultural building, whichever is the lesser;”

6.7.12. The extent of curtilage proposed is considered appropriate and is *“incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling-house”* of this size to enable the occupiers to enjoy some external amenity space and provide a place for drying washing etc. It also provides an area for an external bin store, parking and manoeuvring space for two vehicles and a small patio area outside the main living space. It is proposed that the garden would be simply lawn with a post and rail ‘farm type’ boundary fence to the perimeter and a new native hedge and fence along the Public Right of Way to help define the route and provide privacy to the dwelling from the right of way.

6.7.13. We are of the opinion the size of the curtilage proposed is commensurate to the size of the proposed property and would not constitute a perceived encroachment of the green belt.

7. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

- 7.1. National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) sets the context for planning policies throughout the Country and provides the basis on which local planning policies are formed.
- 7.2. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF places a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Policy states that in decision taking; development that accords with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent or the relevant policies are out of date permission should be granted unless “any adverse impact of doing so would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole”.
- 7.3. The chapters relevant to this application are as follows;
- Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport
- Chapter 11: Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12: Achieving Well designed places
- Chapter 13: Protecting Green Belt Land
- Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

8. THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- 8.1. The saved policies contained within the Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in 1997 serve as the key consideration to the determination of this application.

The policies contained within the plan were formulated prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012 and amended in 2019). In this case, when considering the relevant policies paragraph 213 of the Framework is applicable and states that: “Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given”.

Saved policies of relevance include;

Policy ENV1/1 (Visual Amenity)

Policy EN5/1 (New development and flood risk)

Policy EN6/3 (Features of Ecological Value)

Policy EN9/1 (Special Landscape Areas)

Policy OL1/2 (New Building in the Green Belt)

Policy OL/4 (Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt)

Policy OL7/2 (West Pennine Moors)

Policy HT2/4 (Car Parking and new development) Emerging Planning

Policies

- 8.2. The emerging Bury Local Plan is in early stages of preparation and therefore, at the time of writing this report should not be given weight in the consideration of this application.

Other material Planning considerations

SPD8 - New Buildings and Associated Development in the Green Belt,
Adopted 2007.

SPD 9 Conversion and re use of Buildings in the Green Belt, Adopted
2006.

SPD 11 Parking standards in Bury, Adopted 2007.

9. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that the determination of applications should be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise.
- 9.2. The policies contained within the Development Plan are therefore considered to be the starting point. The Framework however constitutes an important material planning consideration and sets out the government's views as to what constitutes sustainable development.
- 9.3. For decision takers the Framework requires local planning authorities to approve development proposals that accord with the Development Plan without delay and where the plan is absent or silent or policies are out of date, approving planning permission unless the adverse impact would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or specific policies contained within the Framework indicate development should not be restricted.
- 9.4. Having regard to the individual merits of this site, the following are considered to be key matters for consideration:
- The principle of the development having regard to Green Belt policies
 - Whether the proposal represents a sustainable form of development.
- 9.5. Having regard to each of the above matters in turn.

9.6.AN ACCEPTABLE FORM OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT

- 9.6.1. Chapter 13 of the Framework relates to protecting Green Belt Land. This chapter sets out the fundamental aims of Green Belt which is to

keep land permanently open and goes on to set out the type of development which are not inappropriate.

9.6.2.Paragraph 143 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in “very special circumstances”.

9.6.3.Paragraphs 145 and 146 are of most relevance to this case and sets out the forms of development which are considered to be “not inappropriate” or an exception to the policy and therefore acceptable development within the Green Belt. These are:

- Paragraph 146 (D) allows for the re use of buildings provided the building is of a permanent and substantial construction.

- Paragraph 145 (c) allows for the extension of buildings with the green belt provided it does not result in a disproportionate addition.

9.7. Addressing each of the points highlighted above in further detail:

9.7.1.RE USE OF THE EXISTING BUILDING WITHIN THE GREEN BELT

9.7.2. Policy OL/4 of the UDP relates to the Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt and is the most relevant policy for consideration. The policy states that the conversion and re-use of buildings in the green belt is not inappropriate development and will be acceptable provided the following criteria can be met:

- it does not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it;

- any extension of re-used buildings, and any associated uses of land surrounding the building do not conflict with the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it (e.g. because they involve extensive external storage, or extensive hardstanding, car parking, gardens, boundary walling or fencing);
- the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction, and are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction;
- the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings;
- suitable access and likely traffic generation can be accommodated without creating a traffic hazard or the need for major road improvements or lengthy new routes;
- all the necessary services can be provided without extensive works;
- it can be established by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, whether or not the building contains any protected species, such as bats or barn owls. Where it is shown such species are present, measures to prevent damage to habitats will be required.

9.7.3. Having regard to each of the criteria above;

The proposal will not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with openness and the purposes of including land in it

- 9.8. **The principle of the conversion of the existing building has already been established under planning application 65778 which granted prior approval for the conversion of the existing building to a dwelling house.** This is the applicant's 'fallback' position and therefore a significant material planning consideration in the determination of this application.
- 9.9. Differences between the proposals approved under application 65778 and those proposed within this application include a small single-storey extension, which is not disproportionate to the scale of the original building and therefore accords with Green Belt policy set out in paragraph 145 (c) as discussed in further detail in paragraphs 6.33 to 6.43 of this statement below.
- 9.10. The application plot measures approx. 0.0042 Hectares (42.86sqm) and is considered to be a size and configuration commensurate with the scale and position of the proposed dwelling.
- 9.11. The proposed garden provides on-site parking and turning provision as well as a proportionate area of garden amenity land this is required to accommodate the long-term functional needs and ensure a sustainable family home in line with paragraph 127 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments will function well into the future.
- 9.12. The garden curtilage is to be delineated by a post and rail fence to the boundaries. The area proposed is not considered to be extensive and would not have a harmful impact upon the openness of the Green belt, nor the character of the area in accordance with Policy OL1/4.

The buildings are of permanent and substantial construction, and are capable of conversion without major or complete reconstruction

- 9.13. The existing building is constructed in stone and a slate roof and is of sound construction capable of conversion without significant reconstruction, the extent of this is established under application 65778,

which shows that the building can be converted with only minimal alterations required to meet the building standards required.

- 9.14. The building is of a permanent and substantial construction and therefore complies with the requirements of para 146 of the Framework and policy OLI/4 of the UDP.

The form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings

- 9.15. The proposed dwelling has been designed to reflect the rural setting whilst also incorporating high quality design. Plans have been submitted showing minor alterations to the external appearance of the existing building. The envelope of the existing building is to be maintained.
- 9.16. The cast iron columns on the existing building are to be retained. All external alterations including additional fenestration detail and the new covered entrance are considered to be in keeping with the character of the building and the local area.
- 9.17. The proposed extension has been designed sympathetically to be in keeping with the existing building and will be positioned so it is not unduly prominent.
- 9.18. The new dwelling sought is modest in size when compared to properties within the vicinity of the site and is therefore considered to be in keeping with the rural character of this particular area.
- 9.19. The proposal would therefore accord with policy OLI/4 and also saved UDP policies which seek to secure high quality design and ensure developments are in keeping with the character and setting of the area in particular saved policies ENV1/1 and EN9/1.

Suitable access and likely traffic generation can be accommodated without creating a traffic hazard or the need for major road improvements or lengthy new routes;

- 9.20. Access to the site will be served directly from the existing lane.
- 9.21. It should be noted that under application 64308 proposals were made to make significant upgrades to the unadopted road serving both the application site and the 4 dwellings at Meadowcroft Farm. This includes for the location of new passing places and surface treatment to the track. This has now been implemented in full.
- 9.22. There is a sufficient space within the site to accommodate off road parking and the introduction of one new dwelling to this site would therefore have a minimal impact upon highway safety.
- 9.23. All the necessary services including electricity, water and BT have already been brought to the site under application 64308 which has been implemented in part.
- 9.24. It is proposed that the new dwelling will be served via existing services serving Meadowcroft Farm therefore it is not anticipated that the proposal will require any additional extensive works.

There will be no harm to protected species

- 9.25. The proposed development would not have a harmful impact upon the protected species. The principle of converting the building into a dwelling is already established under application 65778 and there was no request by the Local Planning Authority for such a survey to be submitted as part of the prior approval application. The fallback of converting the building under the existing prior approval is a significant material consideration.
- 9.26. An ecological survey has been completed and forms part of this application.

- 9.27. The proposals seek to provide some additional tree and hedge planting to the site and therefore present an opportunity to improve biodiversity on site. The proposal is considered to comply with saved Policy OL1/4 and EN6/3 of the UDP.

9.28. EXTENSION OR ALTERATION OF A BUILDING WITH THE GREEN BELT

- 9.29. A key consideration of Green Belt policy is that the proposed development should not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. This is reflected within Policy OL1/1 of the UDP.
- 9.30. Policy OL1/2 deals specifically with restrictions to new development within the Green Belt. The policy allows for extensions to dwellings. However, in a published document ‘Consistency of UDP Policies with the National Planning Policy Framework’ the Council acknowledge that the list of exception criteria set out within policy OL1/2 (a) to (d) of the UDP are not consistent with the those identified within the Framework.
- 9.31. It is accepted that the remit to what falls as appropriate development has now widened from “dwellings” to “buildings” and therefore it is acknowledged that policy OL1/2 of the UDP is inconsistent with the Framework and therefore the policies contained within the Framework should take precedent.
- 9.32. Paragraph 145 of the Framework allows for the extension of a building within the Green Belt, provided they are not “disproportionate” over and above the size of the original building.
- 9.33. There is no definition as to what is meant by “disproportionate” within national or local planning policy.

- 9.34. SPD 8 provides the closest definition. Adopted in 2007 the policy is (similar to Policy OL1/2) considerably out of date referring to extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt.
- 9.35. Nevertheless, the guidance seeks to ensure that extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt are proportionate to the size of the original dwelling. The advice states that in general, extension above that of the original to be up to a third of the volume of the original dwelling are considered to be acceptable.
- 9.36. The guidance goes on to state that:
“each proposal will be considered on its own merits and even an increase up to a third may not be appropriate in certain situations (e.g. if the site is a particularly sensitive area or if there are other amenity issues).
If an addition to an already converted building is required, the extension should be a subsidiary element of the original building. Extensions should be small scale, of a simple design and unobtrusive. Acceptable designs could include single storey, lean-to gable end or flank extensions.”
- 9.37. The summary below provides a comparison between the proposed and existing development.

Volume

Existing volume = 240.69 m³

Proposed volume = 303.58 m³

Increase in volume = 26.13%

Area Calculations

Existing Gross External Area = 76.48m²

Proposed Gross External Area = 100.21 m²

Increase in Gross External Area = 31.16%

- 9.38. The proposed single storey extension has been designed with a traditional barn ‘cat slide’ roof and therefore considered to be subservient and proportionate with the scale of the original building. The scheme as sought in our view will not represent a disproportionate addition and is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle.
- 9.39. Having regard to the above, the proposals in our view will not have any greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt than the existing building. It is considered that the proposal is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt having regard to the Framework.

9.40.SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- 9.41. Paragraph 11 of the Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute towards achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development is considered to encompass three dimensions; economic, social and environmental, each of which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways.
- 9.42. From an **Economic** perspective the proposal will provide economic benefits as the new dwelling will generate both direct and indirect employment opportunities through new jobs through construction and via the supply chain. It is also anticipated that the proposal will increase indirect spending and provide support to existing local services and facilities.
- 9.43. From a **Social** perspective;

Residential amenity

9.44. The siting of the proposed building would maintain a sufficient distance from nearby neighbouring properties, so as not to have any adverse impact upon existing or future levels of residential amenity.

9.45. From an **Environmental** perspective;

Accessibility

9.46. The site is considered to be in an accessible location. Existing local services and facilities including convenience store, restaurants, primary school in Walshaw are all within a mile of the application site which are accessible on foot or bike. The nearest bus stop to the site is approx. 900m away on Lowercroft Road which serve Bury and beyond.

9.47. The sustainability credentials of this location have been assessed as part of application 64308 which allowed for the conversion of existing buildings at Meadowcroft Farm to form 4 separate dwellings. The fact prior approval has already been granted for the principle of residential on the site indicates that the proposal would represent a sustainable form of development.

Ground Conditions

9.48. A Phase I Geo-environmental Desk Study accompanies this application and was submitted with the prior approval application.

9.49. The Councils Environmental Office concluded that:

“the potential risks to human health and controlled waters from soil contamination and ground gas is low, due to the lack of previous contaminating land uses and potential sources of gas in the area. Therefore, no intrusive investigation is considered necessary.

This assessment appears reasonable. It is recommended that a watching brief be undertaken during the development to identify and deal with any previously unforeseen contamination. When the development is complete, a short Completion Report should be submitted.”

- 9.50. Having regard to the above it was considered that there is a low risk of receptors on site and therefore there are no significant concerns in terms of contamination on this site which cannot be overcome via planning condition, if deemed necessary.
- 9.51. The proposal is therefore a sustainable form of development. There would be no adverse impacts that would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering the proposed development when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

10. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 10.1. Full planning permission is sought for the change of use with a modest extension of an existing agricultural building to provide a family dwelling.
- 10.2. **The principle of a residential use at this site has already been established under planning application 65778 and this should be viewed as a weighty material planning consideration when determining this application.**
- 10.3. The proposal seeks to marginally increase the footprint with a small-scale single storey extension which will be proportionate to the size of the original building. This paired with the garden curtilage is considered to be commensurate to the size of the house whilst allow for a more sustainable form of development which will accommodate the long-term future needs of the occupiers.
- 10.4. Having regard to the above the proposed development in our view, is considered to comprise “appropriate development” within the Green Belt which will not have a harmful impact upon openness or conflict with the purposes of including land within it. We are therefore of the view that the proposal satisfies policies the relevant saved policy OL1/4 of the UDP and objectives within Framework.
- 10.5. The proposed development has been carefully designed to provide a modern and sympathetic design which is in keeping with the existing building, location of the site and the character of the surrounding area.
- 10.6. In line with paragraph 11 of the Framework a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied. There are no adverse impact as a result of this development which would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The proposal complies with Green Belt policies and should therefore be granted without delay.