

ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING REGULATORY BOARD

VISIT OF INSPECTION – THURSDAY, 31ST MARCH, 2016

1. **RB2015/1311** – Erection of agricultural building, at land off Ramper Road, Letwell, Worksop

Requested by:- Members of the Planning Board

Reason:- To allow Members to consider the impact of the proposed development upon the village of Letwell and the Conservation Area there.

<u>No.</u>	<u>Application</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Arrival</u>	<u>Departure</u>
1.	RB2015/1311	Letwell	9.25 a.m.	9.45 a.m.

Return to the Town Hall for approximately 10.15 a.m.

SITE VISIT NO. 1 (Approximate time on site - 9.25 a.m.)

Application Number	RB2015/1311
Proposal and Location	Erection of agricultural building, at land off Ramper Road, Letwell, Worksop
Recommendation	Grant subject to conditions

This application is being presented to Planning Board due to the number of objections received.



Site Description & Location

The site of application consists of a roughly square piece of land located off Ramper Road, Letwell. The site has an existing hard surfaced access road off Ramper Road and appears to have been used for informal open storage in relation to the agricultural field adjacent. It is approximately 42m x 32m and is located directly opposite the Grade II Listed converted former agricultural buildings known as North Farm. The site is located at the entrance to the village from the north and is highly visually prominent as part of the approach to Letwell. The site is located immediately adjacent to the Letwell Conservation Area and is approximately 170 metres away from the Grade II* Listed St Peter's Church. There are residential properties directly opposite the site as part of North Farm and properties to the south.

The applicant's farm is located at South Farm which is within Letwell village itself, approximately 180m from the application site.

Background

No planning history relating to the application site. It is apparent from aerial photos that an open sided barn building was once located on the site, and it is understood that this building, which had an approximate floor area of 170sqm, was demolished around 2005

Proposal

The application was originally submitted for a grain store and drying building with a separate section for machinery storage. The building would have measured 33m x 30.5 metres and would have been 8.5 metres high. The building would have been covered in fibre cement sheets with plastisol coated profiled steel sheets to the walls set on a concrete panel plinth. The building would have had roller shutter doors to the front.

Further to concerns raised by local residents and negotiations with the applicants the scheme has been significantly amended. The proposed building would now just been used for agricultural machinery storage only such as tractors, drill and disc cutters that are associated with arable farming and has been reduced in floor area by approximately 30%. Its length would be 3.5m longer than originally proposed though its width has been reduced by approximately 12m from that originally proposed, with a total length of 36.5 metres and a width of 18.2 metres. The height to the ridge of the roof would remain at 8.5 metres. The building would be set at 90 degrees to the road with the frontage of the building being open. The site area has also been reduced and the building moved further forward on the site, closer to Ramper Road. The total site area including turning and an access road is approximately 3,000 square metres, as opposed to the existing area used for informal open storage which is approximately 1,000 square metres.

The proposals have also been amended by changing the proposed materials from plastisol coated sheeting. The building would now be constructed of fibre cement sheets for the roof with the wall being clad with timber Yorkshire Boarding with 140mm thick concrete panels 2 metres in height from ground level. The applicants have also proposed a landscaping scheme to the northern boundary of the site which they have indicated could grow to 4 metres in height to soften the appearance of the building. The applicants have confirmed that the hedgerow to the front of the site fronting Ramper Road would be retained. To the front of the building the land would be hardsurfaced to provide a vehicular turning area the total area of hardstanding would extend to approximately 1,800 square metres.

The applicants have submitted a Supporting Statement which sets out the following in support of the application:

- There was a Dutch Barn previously on this site and an area of hardstanding.
- They chose to build one large building to serve this farm rather than erect a number of smaller buildings under agricultural permitted development as this would have a lesser impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
- The building has been sympathetically designed to suit its agricultural surroundings.

The building would use the existing access with turning facilities within the site.

Development Plan Allocation and Policy

The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on the 10th September 2014 and forms part of Rotherham's Local Plan together with 'saved' policies from the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (noted in Appendix B of the Core Strategy). The Rotherham Local Plan 'Publication Sites and Policies' was published in September 2015.

The application site is allocated for Green Belt purposes in the UDP and is within an Area of High Landscape Value. For the purposes of determining this application the following policies are considered to be of relevance:

Core Strategy policy(s):

CS4 'Green Belt'
CS23 'Valuing the Historic Environment'
CS28 'Sustainable Design'

Unitary Development Plan 'saved' policy(s):
ENV1.2 'Development in Areas of High Landscape Value'
ENV2.8 'Settings and Curtilages of Listed Buildings'
ENV2.12 'Development adjacent to Conservation Areas'

Other Material Considerations

Interim Planning Guidance - 'Development in the Green Belt'. This has been subject to public consultation and adopted by the Council on 3rd March 2014 and replaces the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Environment Guidance 1 – 'Extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt' of the UDP.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) - On 6 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched this planning practice guidance web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement which includes a list of the previous planning practice guidance documents cancelled when this site was launched.

National Planning Policy Framework: The NPPF came into effect on March 27th 2012 and replaced all previous Government Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs) and most of the Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) that existed. It states that "Development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan, and every decision.

The NPPF states that "due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans 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)."

The Core Strategy/Unitary Development Plan policies referred to above are consistent with the NPPF and have been given due weight in the determination of this application.

Publicity

The application has been advertised in the Press as affecting the setting of the Letwell Conservation Area and Listed Buildings known as North Farm and St Peter's Church. The application has also been advertised by site notice and by letter to neighbouring residents. In respect of the original submission the Council received 23 representations objecting to the application and 4 representations in support. Letwell Parish Council has also objected to the application.

Letwell Parish Council's comments are as follows:

- The proposal is for a large industrial style building which would harm the approach to the village and the setting of the Conservation Area.
- The building would cause noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.
- The village had a meeting about this application and there was unanimous opposition from villagers about the scheme.
- The building would dominate the landscape and views to the village.
- The building would be a traffic hazard.
- Letwell will turn into an industrial estate.
- The applicant should find an alternative more suitable location for this type of building.
- There are errors on the application form and on the submitted documents.

The objections received from neighbouring residents are summarised as follows:

- The building harms the setting of the Letwell Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings, namely Grade II Listed North Farm and the Grade II* Listed St Peter's Church.
- The building is industrial in appearance and would be an eyesore in this rural location at the approach to the village in this Area of High Landscape Value.
- The industrial nature of this building would harm the largely residential character of the village and make it feel like living on an industrial estate.
- The use of the building would lead to noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.
- The drying facilities at the grain store would harm the amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of noise disturbance.
- The access to the site is dangerous opposite North Farm entrance and close to a bend in the road. As the site would be used by heavy farm machinery this could be very dangerous to traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.
- Hedgerows would have to be removed to allow access into the site.
- The building could cause drainage problems in the local area.
- The building could obscure a historic right of way to the church from Ramper Road.
- There is an acceptance for the requirement for this building on the farm though more suitable sites are available on the farmers land for this building.
- Vehicles entering and existing the site could damage the highway verge and could cause damage to the road surface.

- The building would lead to a loss of view.
- There are inaccuracies on the drawings and on the application form.
- Light pollution from the building.
- The applicant is trying to deceive local residents.
- The building does not resemble the Dutch Barn that used to be located on the site.
- The building could be used as a grain store in the future.
- Restrictions on how the building is to be used should be added to any planning permission granted in this respect.

The representations in support are summarised below:

- Support the application the site previously had a Dutch barn sited on it and the site has been used for the agricultural storage e.g sugar beet
- The building is an integral part of the agricultural activities at the farm
- The building is not a grain store.
- Constructing this building on the edge of the farm yard of South Farm would encroach into prime crop growing land. Siting it on a previously developed site, which this site is with low crop value is the most sensible location for this building. it would not be sensible or acceptable for further development beyond the existing farm yard.
- Letwell is historically a farming village. The nature of modern farming requires buildings like this in order for British farming to remain competitive.
- Old redundant farm buildings have been converted into residential use across the road. This approach to Letwell previously had agricultural buildings on it on both sides of the road.

Further publicity took place in respect of the revised plans and further additional comments were received, though most reiterated concerns previously raised noting that none of the original concerns of local residents have been addressed as part of the amended scheme. Additional comments included that the village of Letwell was becoming overwhelmed by agricultural activities and this was harming the quality of life for local residents.

The Parish Council stated that 30 residents of 37 households have objected to this application.

There are a number of residents who have asked to speak at the Meeting, with the final number yet to be confirmed, and the applicant's agent has also asked to speak.

Consultations

Streetpride (Transportation & Highways): Raise no objections to the proposals in highway safety terms and recommend that the front of the site is suitably hard surfaced to provide an adequate turning and manoeuvring area for vehicles.

Streetpride (Drainage): Has requested further details in respect of how the site will be drained and this will be addressed by way of a planning condition.

Historic England: Raise no objections to the proposal though consider that the proposal would result in minor harm to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Church and the Letwell

Conservation Area. In respect of the original proposal they recommend that the scheme be amended to incorporate a landscaping scheme and use traditional materials and to reduce its size further to reduce this minor harm. The revised proposal now includes a landscaping scheme and the use of Yorkshire boarding though no further comments have been received from Historic England.

CPRE: Have stated that the scale and appearance of the building would impact on the Letwell Conservation Area because it is a gateway to the village. They have advised that reducing the height and changing the materials of the building would mitigate the visual impact (they have not commented further on the revised materials now proposed). They have also raised concerns about the intensification of activity at the site for neighbouring residential amenity. The overall character and scale of farming activity seems to have substantially outgrown the character and scale of the location. However, the CPRE stated that they did not wish to hinder the continued success of the farm.

Appraisal

Where an application is made to a local planning authority for planning permission.....In dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to -

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations. - S. 70 (2) TCPA '90.

If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise - S.38 (6) PCPA 2004.

The main issues to take into consideration in the determination of the application are –

- The principle of the development and impact on the openness of the Green Belt
- Impact on the setting of designated heritage assets and design issues
- Impact on an Area of High Landscape Value
- Transportation issues
- Drainage and flood issues
- Impact on ecology
- General amenity issues
- Geotechnical issues
- Other issues raised by objectors

Principle of the development and impact on the openness of the Green Belt

Policy CS4 Green Belt states that: "Land within the Rotherham Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development as set out in national planning policy".

This policy advice is further re-iterated in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states at paragraph 89 that: "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this (amongst others) include:

- Buildings for agriculture and forestry."

The Council's Interim Planning Guidance on 'Development in the Green Belt,' further notes: "Any new agricultural or forestry building or structure must be needed, designed

and constructed only for agricultural or forestry purposes. This prevents the building of property which is intended to be converted (for example, into a home). In accordance with Part 6 the General Permitted Development Order, any new building not used for agriculture within 10 years shall be removed.”

The applicant has indicated that the building would be used for the storage of agricultural machinery and would be open fronted to the road. South Farm is a large working farm which covers approximately 2,300 acres within the locality. It is considered that the building is reasonably required to serve this large holding and the proposed use of the building in association with agriculture does not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

It is noted that a number of neighbouring residents and Letwell Parish Council have suggested that the farmer could locate the building in an alternative location on land that he controls, such as at South Farm itself or elsewhere. It is noted that planning permission has previously been granted at South Farm for a number of agricultural buildings, including a grain store in 1979, an agricultural building in 1986, and an agricultural storage building in 2007 (RB2007/0495). More recently, planning permission was granted for the erection of a grain store in 2013 (RB2013/0005). These buildings have all been erected such that there is no room left available on the South Farm site itself for further buildings.

The applicant has stated that he wishes to build on the current application site off Ramper Road as he owns the land, and notes that the land directly behind South Farm is rented. He further notes that he is intending to convert one of the existing buildings on the South Farm site to a further grain store, and move the agricultural machinery within the existing building into the proposed building.

In terms of other alternative locations for the building the applicant has considered this matter, including a site suggested by some objectors off a track near Moorlands Farm on Gildingwells Road, and the possibility of this then becoming a grain drying facility. The problem with now reverting to a grain drying facility on such remote parcels of land lies with the necessary power for drying grain through the fanned ventilation systems. He notes that on a similar grain drying facility elsewhere in the Borough the power requirements for installing a supply back to a main in the highway cost around £40,000 due to the length of cabling, size of cabling required due to voltage drop and the trenching works required. He notes that the technicalities and logistics of placing the building elsewhere and used it for drying grain are very far reaching and expensive. There are also matters of legal ownership which discount some sites. The applicant has asked that the application be considered on the site of application and its context against current policy and guidance.

In terms of assessing the impact on the openness of the Green Belt it is noted that the building is very large and would inevitably have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. However, the building is not inappropriate development and the applicant has a clear functional requirement for this building on this very large agricultural holding.

It is considered that the impact on the openness of the Green Belt is mitigated by the fact that the building is located immediately adjacent to the built up area of the village of Letwell and is seen against the backdrop of the village.

Impact on the setting of designated heritage assets and design issues

The site of application is located on the edge of Letwell Conservation Area though no part of the site falls within it. The site is also adjacent to a group of former agricultural buildings which are Grade II Listed known as North Farm. These buildings have been converted into residential use and North Farm is no longer a working farm. The site is also approximately 170 metres east of the Grade II* Church of St Peter's and the agricultural building would be highly visually prominent when viewed alongside these designated heritage assets.

In terms of assessing the impact on the setting of these designated heritage assets, Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, states "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Core Strategy Policy CS23 'Valuing the Historic Environment' states that "Rotherham's historic environment will be conserved, enhanced and managed, in accordance with the principles set out below (which includes amongst other things that):

- d. Proposals will be supported which protect the heritage significance and setting of locally identified heritage assets such as buildings of local architectural or historic interest, locally important archaeological sites and parks and gardens of local interest."

In addition, UDP Policy ENV2.8 'Settings and Curtilages of Listed Buildings' states "The Council will resist development proposals which detrimentally affect the setting of a listed building or are harmful to its curtilage structures in order to preserve its setting and historical context."

UDP Policy ENV2.12 'Development adjacent to Conservation Areas' states that: "In considering proposals for developments adjacent to Conservation Areas, special regard will be had to their effect on the Conservation Areas and, if necessary, modifications to ameliorate the effect will be required before approval is given."

Paragraph 129 of the NPPF states that "Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal."

The NPPF notes at paragraph 132 that "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification."

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that “Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”

In terms of assessing the impact of the design of the property Policy CS28 ‘Sustainable Design,’ states that: “Proposals for development should respect and enhance the distinctive features of Rotherham. They should develop a strong sense of place with a high quality of public realm and well designed buildings within a clear framework of routes and spaces. Development proposals should be responsive to their context and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.”

The NPPF notes at paragraph 56 that: “The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.” Paragraph 64 adds that: “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.”

The landscape character surrounding these designated heritage assets is attractive and undeveloped and rural in nature. This attractive landscape character contributes positively to the setting of these designated heritage assets and reinforces the small scale nature of the village as a rural and agricultural settlement. The network of fields surrounding this linear agricultural village provides an historic context and visual connection with the settlement.

On entering the village from the north, along Ramper Road, there are long distance views of both the application site and the Church’s landmark 15th century tower which defines the edge of the village of Letwell.

Historic England were consulted on the application and they considered that the proposed development would result in minor harm to the setting of the Grade II* listed Church and to the Letwell Conservation Area and raised concerns about the palette of materials of the building and the design of the structure and its footprint and height. They recommend that more traditional materials should be used and a robust landscaping scheme should be implemented in order to reduce the impact of the proposal on the setting of the two designated heritage assets.

These comments from Historic England have been noted and further to negotiations with the applicants they have agreed to use the more traditional cladding of Yorkshire timber boarding and have agreed to provide a landscaping scheme to the north of the site. The applicants have stated that the building had been reduced in size significantly from that originally proposed and that further reductions in size would make the building impractical. The applicant notes that the building as proposed is some 4m less in height than that permitted under permitted development rights for agricultural buildings and that these buildings are specifically designed to accommodate equipment and machinery that have extending and rising booms and forks and methods of operation that necessitate the internal height of the buildings to be sufficient to allow vehicles and machinery to be safely operated, manoeuvred and maintained. He adds that the 12m height allowed under permitted development rights has been assessed and determined as the most suitable maximum height and that to lower the height of the proposed

building would be almost reducing it to a single storey, which is not sufficient for the needs of the building.

It is considered that the alterations to the external appearance of the building utilising more traditional materials would considerably soften its appearance and along with the landscaping scheme would reduce the visual impact of the building on the setting of the Conservation Area and the Grade II* Listed Church and the Grade II Listed North Farm.

However, it is noted that the proposed building is a very large structure in relation to neighbouring properties and would lead to less than substantial harm to the setting of the Letwell Conservation Area and to the setting of the Grade II Listed North Farm and the Grade II* Listed Church of St Peter. It is considered that this harm has been minimised by the reduction in the proposed size of the building and the use of more appropriate materials and suitable landscaping, and it is accepted that a further reduction in the size of the building would make the scheme impractical. Furthermore, the NPPF advises that “this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.” In this case the public benefit is the ongoing viability of the farm which is an economic benefit as it is the only economically significant activity within the village and to the rural economy.

Impact on an Area of High Landscape Value

The Council’s Interim Planning Guidance ‘Development in the Green Belt’ states at paragraph 7 (a) that: “...all applications for new agricultural or forestry buildings or structures must be needed and designed only for agricultural or forestry purposes. This prevents the building of property which is intended to be converted (for example, into a home).”

Policy ENV1.2 ‘Development in Areas of High Landscape Value’ states that: “In areas of High Landscape Value, development other than for agriculture will only be allowed where it will not result in a significant, and permanent adverse impact on the landscape. New agricultural buildings and ancillary development requiring planning permission will normally be allowed, provided they are not detrimental to the local environment, as will agricultural dwellings where a genuine agricultural need for them is demonstrated. Strict control will be exercised over the development that does take place to ensure that the visual character of these areas is not affected.”

With regards to the harm to the Area of High Landscape Value, the landform in this locality is characterised in the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment 2010 as falling under Section 10b Sandbeck Parkland fringes. It was assessed in 2010 as having a moderate strength of character, with a desire to improve and conserve.

In terms of landscape impact it is considered that the building would lead to slight harm to landscape character by its presence and size. However, it is considered that its materials and the presence of the proposed landscaping scheme would significantly mitigate these impacts. Furthermore, as the building is seen against the backdrop of the village of Letwell it would have less landscape impact as if it were in an exposed location.

Transportation issues

It is noted that a number of neighbouring residents have raised concerns about the proposals in terms of highway safety. However, the Council's Transportation Unit raised no objections to the proposals in highway safety terms and recommend that the front of the site is suitably hard surfaced to provide an adequate turning and maneuvering area for vehicles.

Impact on ecology

The NPPF notes at paragraph 109 that the "planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: (amongst other things) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils."

The NPPF states at paragraph 118 states that "When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles: (amongst other things)

- opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged."

It is noted that objectors have raised concerns about proposed development in terms of wildlife impact, though specific details of this impact are not provided. Whilst this is noted and that the applicant has not submitted an ecological survey, the site in question is not known to have any ecological significance. Furthermore it is noted that a neighbouring resident raised concerns about the possibility of removing a hedgerow at the entrance of the site. Whilst this is noted this is not proposed and the applicants are proposing a landscaping scheme which could potentially lead to biodiversity gain at the site using appropriate native species.

As such, it is considered that subject to an appropriate landscaping condition the development could lead to biodiversity gain at the site fully in accordance with the guidance contained in the NPPF.

General amenity issues

UDP Policy ENV3.7 'Control of Pollution' states that: "The Council, in consultation with other appropriate agencies, will seek to minimise the adverse effects of nuisance, disturbance and pollution associated with development and transport."

The NPPF states that within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. Amongst these 12 principles, it states that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and building.

It adds at paragraph 123 that: Planning policies and decisions should aim to:

- avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development;
mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions"

It is noted that the building would be located approximately 36 metres away from the nearest residential property Horseshoe Cottage, No. 3 North Farm and approximately 38

metres from No. 7 Gildingwells Road. It is noted that the application has been significantly amended since the original submission and the building would be used for the storage of machinery only and would not be used for grain drying, which would have involved the use of grain drying machinery which could have potentially increased noise impact.

It is noted that neighbouring residents have raised concerns about the possibility of noise and disturbance on the building and have suggested that restrictions be placed on noise levels and vehicle movements and other activities on the site to prevent harm to their amenity. Whilst this is noted it is considered that the use of the building for the storage of farm machinery and vehicles would not harm the residential amenity of neighbouring residents. The main noise and disturbance would be from tractors and other vehicles and machinery entering and exiting the site. Whilst this would lead to a greater degree of noise disturbance than at present it is considered that this would not necessarily be any greater than the existing road noise and owing to the distance from the site, would not lead to significant harm to residential amenity.

Whilst it is noted that considerations restricting the use of the site have been suggested it is not considered appropriate in this instance. The nature of farming is such that the movement of farm vehicles may be necessary very early morning and late into the night, for example during harvest, and it would be unreasonable to restrict the use of the building on this basis. In terms of other noise and disturbance it is noted that the building would not be used as a grain store. However, it is considered reasonable to append a condition restricting the building to a general agricultural use and not to be used for mechanical grain drying.

It is noted that concerns have been raised about the possibility of light pollution from the building in terms of lighting on the building and lights from the farm vehicles using the site. It is noted that external lighting is not included in this application. In terms of light from vehicles this would occur on an occasional basis though it is considered that this would not lead to significant harm to residential amenity as it would occur on an irregular basis.

Other issues raised by objectors

Neighbouring residents have raised a number of different objections to the scheme, including loss of view which is not a material planning consideration. It is noted that concern was raised that the building could encroach upon an historic right of way from Ramper Road to the Church. Whilst this is noted there is no public footpath across this site. If there is an historic right of way this would be a civil matter and cannot be taken into consideration as part of this application.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed agricultural building is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and whilst it is accepted that a building of this size will inevitably have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this location, it is accepted that the size of the building proposed is commensurate with the requirements of the farm, and that the benefits of providing the additional agricultural facility would outweigh the impact in this instance.. It is considered that its design, materials and the proposed landscaping scheme would mitigate the impact of the building on the adjacent Letwell Conservation Area, and Grade II Listed North Farm and the Grade II* Listed Church of St Peter. It is

not considered that the building would harm the character and appearance of an Area of High Landscape Value.

It is considered that the use of the building would not harm the residential amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of noise and disturbance, subject to the recommended condition.

It is considered that the building would not harm highway safety or lead to any drainage problems subject to the recommended conditions.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted for the proposed development.

Conditions

01

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason

In order to comply with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

02

The permission hereby granted shall relate to the area shown outlined in red on the approved site plan and the development shall only take place in accordance with the submitted details and specifications as shown on the approved plans (as set out below) (Drawing number CS/010687/2B)(received 19/02/2016)(Drawing Number CS/01687/2D)(Received 17/03/2016)

Reason

To define the permission and for the avoidance of doubt.

03

The agricultural building hereby approved shall be used for agricultural storage purposes only and shall not be used for any grain drying purposes unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of neighbouring amenity in accordance with UDP Policy ENV3.7 Control of Pollution.

04

No above ground construction of the proposed building shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted or samples of the materials have been left on site, and the details/samples have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Reason

To ensure that appropriate materials are used in the construction of the development in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS28 'Sustainable Design.'

05

Before the development is brought into use, that part of the site to be used by vehicles shall be constructed with either;

- a/ a permeable surface and associated water retention/collection drainage, or;
- b/ an impermeable surface with water collected and taken to a separately constructed water retention/discharge system within the site.

The area shall thereafter be maintained in a working condition.

Reason

To ensure that surface water can adequately be drained and that mud and other extraneous material is not deposited on the public highway and that the building can be reached conveniently from the highway in the interests of the adequate drainage of the site, road safety and residential amenity and in accordance with UDP Policy HG5 'The Residential Environment'.

06

Prior to completion of the development, a detailed landscape scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The landscape scheme shall be prepared to a minimum scale of 1:200 and shall clearly identify through supplementary drawings where necessary:

- The extent of existing planting, including those trees or areas of vegetation that are to be retained, and those that it is proposed to remove.
- The extent of any changes to existing ground levels, where these are proposed.
- Any constraints in the form of existing or proposed site services, or visibility requirements.
- Areas of structural and ornamental planting that are to be carried out.
- The positions, design, materials and type of any boundary treatment to be erected.
- A planting plan and schedule detailing the proposed species, siting, quality and size specification, and planting distances.
- A written specification for ground preparation and soft landscape works.
- The programme for implementation.
- Written details of the responsibility for maintenance and a schedule of operations, including replacement planting, that will be carried out for a period of 5 years after completion of the planting scheme.

The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved landscape scheme within a timescale agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure that there is a well laid out scheme of healthy trees and shrubs in the interests of amenity and in accordance with UDP Policies ENV3 'Borough Landscape', ENV3.1 'Development and the Environment', ENV3.2 'Minimising the Impact of Development' and ENV3.4 'Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows'.

07

Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the method of surface water drainage on the site, including details of any off-site works, shall be submitted to and

approved by the Local Planning Authority and the approved details shall be implemented before the development is brought into use.

Reason

To ensure that the development can be properly drained in accordance with UDP policies ENV3.2 'Minimising the Impact of Development' and ENV3.7 'Control of Pollution'.

The Development Management Procedure Order 2015 requires that planning authorities provide written reasons in the decision notice for imposing planning conditions that require particular matters to be approved before development can start. Condition 7 of this permission requires matters to be approved before development works begin; however, in this instance the condition is justified because:

- i. In the interests of the expedient determination of the application it was considered to be appropriate to reserve certain matters of detail for approval by planning condition rather than unnecessarily extending the application determination process to allow these matters of detail to be addressed pre-determination.
- ii. The details required are fundamental to the acceptability of the development and the nature of the further information required to satisfy these conditions is such that it would be inappropriate to allow the development to proceed until the necessary approvals have been secured.

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

The applicant and the Local Planning Authority engaged in pre application discussions to consider the development before the submission of the planning application. The application was submitted on the basis of these discussions, or was amended to accord with them. It was considered to be in accordance with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.