

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11 August 2022

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
5 Land Adjacent The Old Grain Store Old Epperstone Road Lowdham 21/01830/FUL	Neighbour	06.08.2022	Letter omitted from yesterday's late representations	Attached
6 Thurgarton Quarters Farm, Priory Road, Thurgarton, NG25 0RW 22/00947/FUL	Agent	11.08.2022	<p>1. Concern that the site should be regarded as previously developed land (PDL) as there is an equestrian use and car/van hire operating from one of the buildings which should be regarded as PDL. On this basis greater weight should be given to the re-use of this PDL for housing.</p> <p>2. Removal of Leylandii hedges would occur with the implementation of the Class Q conversion of Agricultural Building A such that the alleged harm through their loss would still arise irrespective of the fall-back position. The Class Q conversion would therefore be just as visible as the replacement scheme and the benefit of replacing with native planting should be given greater weight and would not be brought about by the Class Q scheme.</p> <p>3. Bankwood Farm was not assessed with the same comparison table that has been used in the committee report. The Bankwood Farm scheme approved dwellings with significantly larger combined floorspace than the Class Q fallback on the site but resulted in an overall reduction in built form which is the same in this application. There is no rationale for only comparing the scheme against the Class Q scheme.</p>	<p>1. The alleged equestrian and car/van uses are not lawful uses of the site and as such have not been given any weight in the assessment of whether the site should be regarded as PDL. Officers consider that the lawful use is agricultural and indeed it is asserted by the Applicant that the site is solely in use as part of an agricultural holding in order to qualify for permitted development rights under Class Q. As such this does not alter the assessment as set out in the committee report.</p> <p>2. The Class Q scheme did not provide any detail on the removal of the leylandii hedges. Nevertheless it is noted that this hedge is not protected and could be removed without consent. It is also not worthy of protection by TPO and this is explained in the committee report. The Class Q conversion would result in the same built form and massing as existing which is not comparable to the proposed scheme. As such this does not alter the assessment as set out in the committee report.</p> <p>3. Each application must be assessed on its own merits, however it is clear from reading the</p>

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11 August 2022

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

				bankwood farm report that there was an assessment of the difference between scale and massing between the proposed scheme and the fall-back position despite it not being articulated in numerical terms. The table included within the committee report is intended to set out clearly what the difference would be in this case to assist members. Officers remain of the view that it is pertinent to compare the reality of the fallback position with the proposed scheme rather than comparing all existing buildings/structures on site as they are typical agricultural buildings for this setting which are not required to be removed and would not otherwise be converted to residential use.
8 Land at Post Office Farm, Ossington	Neighbouring Resident	11.08.2022	<p>Letter received addressed to Members of the Planning Committee. In summary this letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfirms objection for reasons stated in the report. • Refers to the legislation (extract is enclosed) and states this is being ignored. • Building 1- applicant declared it wouldn't be used for cattle, this is being allowed which is wrong and 400m has not been mentioned or considered. The building is 56m from curtilage of resident's property. • Building 2 – the unauthorised use of building 1 gave credibility for this approval. Why were no checks made and why was 400m ignored? The building is 78m from curtilage. • Building 3 – 96m from curtilage. Objector has lived on farm for 40 years. No objections were made previously due to good will to the neighbour which is regretted now they live with activities 7 days a week with no controls. 	<p>The objections previously made have been summarised and reported in the main committee report. This raises no new issues.</p> <p>Page 76/77 of the committee report sets out the background/context for the consideration of this application and the position with regards buildings 1 and 2.</p> <p>The position with regards the 400m referred to is set out on page 78 of the Committee Report.</p> <p>This objection does not change the recommendation.</p>

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11 August 2022

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

			Requests that Members check their understanding of the 400m rule and consider that the application is flawed. Asks Members to consider refusal or deferment to resolve the situation.	