DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

Application Reference Number	15NP0004
Description / Site Address	Agricultural determination in respect of proposed shed for storage of agricultural equipment at Farglow, Greenhead, Brampton, Cumbria, CA8 7JB
Consultation Expiry	N/A
Last date for decision	23 February 2015

Details of Proposal

This application is submitted to determine whether prior approval is required from the local planning authority to request further details of the siting, design and location for a proposed agricultural building located to the north of the main farmhouse buildings at Farglow, Greenhead. This request to the local planning authority is made under Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 (as amended).

The proposed building would be a juniper green metal profile sheet clad building, standing at a maximum height of 5.5 metres, with a 3.35 metre eaves height. The building would have a footprint of 13.8 by 6.1 metres and would run parallel to the main farmhouse buildings, which appear to be in good condition and are of a traditional stone and slate construction, which have lower eaves heights than the proposed building, and with ridge heights that appear to range from approximately 5 to 7 metres high.

The proposed building would be located within an existing stone boundary wall, which stands at around two metres high.

Planning Policy

N/A

Relevant Planning History:

N/A

Summary of Consultations/Representations

NNPA Historic Environment Officer: No comments received.

NNPA Access & Recreation Officer: No objection

NNPA Ecologist: No objection

NNPA Landscape & Forestry Officer: No objections. The proposed development will not have a significant effect upon the landscape character or views of this part of the National Park and the proposed development will not affect any notable trees or hedges.

NNPA Farming Officer (South): Considers that the proposal will have a positive effect.

Farglow Farm is a registered agricultural holding of 238.6 ha in size.

The farming on site will be based on Hill Sheep and Suckler Cows and would be a viable enterprise. It is understood that the building will be used to store forage for the sheep in the winter and would be an integral part of the business as the other outbuildings are totally insufficient for this purpose.

It is not considered that there are any negative issues and that the location, class of use and size of prospective building, precludes any groundwater problems and encourages a more active style of farming on this holding, which is an improvement.

Assessment

The following matters will be discussed in this report:

- The principle of the development
- The siting, location and design of the building

Principle of the Development

Agricultural buildings can be constructed under permitted development rights given by Part 6 of the GPDO, provided that they are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and meet with the other criteria set out in this legislation. Where these criteria are met, the local planning authority can only assess whether prior approval is required to assess the siting, location and design of the proposed building. While the site visit did not indicate that there was any evidence of a current agricultural enterprise at the site, the National Park's Farming Officer has confirmed that the site is a registered agricultural holding and that the building is proposed in connection with and would be reasonably necessary for a viable farming enterprise to be carried out on this holding.

The development is on a holding in excess of 5 ha in area, therefore criteria a - i of A1 and conditions 1 - 4 of Part 6 of the GPDO must be met. Based on the information available, all of these requirements appear to have been met in this case. As these criteria are met and the building is considered to be reasonably necessary for agricultural purposes, the principle of the development is deemed to be acceptable by Part 6 of the GPDO and is not a matter to be determined by the local planning authority.

Design, Siting, Location

The building is proposed in a sensible location to the north of the existing farmhouse, which would hide the proposal from view from the immediate approach heading north towards Farglow, which is at the end of a track serving several farms to the south west of the site, many of which have a number of large agricultural buildings, such as Low Tipalt and High Old Shields. The building's location within the property's existing stone boundary walls would also remove the ability to see a large proportion of the building from outside the site and ensures that it remains closely linked to the main buildings.

The choice of green metal cladding is a suitable external material for an agricultural building that would not introduce any uncharacteristic visual element into its surroundings. The scale

of the building would not be excessive, nor would it dominate the existing row of stone and slate buildings at Farglow. Other properties are a substantial distance away and the surrounding landscape is characterised by large rises and dips in land levels, which means the building could only be seen from very immediate viewpoints and would not be easily viewed within the wider landscape. The nearest public receptor point, other than the road leading to the property, is the Greenhead public bridleway 23, lying approximately 350 metres to the south. The proposal should not adversely affect views from here.

The site lies within the Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site (WHS). The siting, location and design of the proposal would not impact upon the ability to comprehend and appreciate the Roman frontier and Roman military planning and land use, which are the basis for the designation of the WHS.

The building is also situated outside of the nearby Tipalt Burn SSSI and would not impact upon it.



Wider views of Farglow on approach road from the south (above/below)





Existing agricultural buildings at Low Tipalt



Immediate approach to Farglow



Location of proposed building

Recommendation

In light of the assessment detailed above, it is considered that prior approval is **NOT** required.

	Signature	Date
Planning Officer		
Head of Development		
Management		
OR		
National Park Officer		