

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	2 September 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for Economy and Communications
Report Author	Ryan Killeen
Public/Private Document	Public

Application: 20/01459/FUL	Township: Middleton	Ward: West Middleton
Appeal Reference: APP/P4225/D/21/3272939		Decision level: Delegated
Site Address: Old Barn House, 5 Whittle Lane, Heywood OL10 2RB		
Proposal: Erection of storage building including the formation of new access, hardstanding and entrance gates (part-retrospective)		
Applicant: Mr Douglas Cronshaw	Agent: Mr Benjamin Maguire	
Planning Inspectorate Decision: Appeal Dismissed – 4 August 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The application was refused as it comprised inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would harm the openness of the Green Belt. There were no other considerations which would outweigh this harm. – Reference was made to the definition of agriculture provided within Section 336 of the Town and Country Planning Act. The Inspector did not consider the activity of mowing and maintaining grassland for the purposes of amenity to constitute an agricultural activity, and as such the building would not be used for agricultural purposes. As the building would not be for the purposes of agriculture, the development was considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. – In respect of the harm to the openness of the Green belt, the Inspector considered the building to have a visual and spatial impact upon the Green Belt because it would result in the erection of a building where there are currently none, particularly in winter months when the trees would not be in leaf. – The appellant highlighted that there was a requirement for the building to store ride-on mowers and a tractor used in grounds maintenance along Whittle Lane. The appellant stated that equipment has been stolen and damaged recently. The Inspector attached limited weight to these considerations as the appellant currently maintains the land and therefore the development would not improve the amenity value of the local area. – The Inspector concluded that the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and would also cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The advanced considerations relating to the need to store the equipment due to deterioration and security were given limited weight which was not considered to clearly outweigh the totality of the harm that was identified and the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development did not exist. 		