



Report to Planning Committee on 16 March 2023

Business Manager Lead: Lisa Hughes – Planning Development

Lead Officer: Steve Cadman, Planner

Report Summary			
Application Number	22/01637/FUL		
Proposal	Conversion of existing building to residential and existing stable to ancillary garaging and store		
Location	The Dutch Barn at Southwell Road, Lowdham		
Applicant	Mr and Mrs R Mason	Agent	Mr Nick Baseley
Web Link	22/01637/FUL Conversion of existing building to residential and existing stable to ancillary garaging and store The Dutch Barn At Southwell Road Lowdham (newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk)		
Registered	15.09.2022	Target Date	10.11.2022
		Extension of Time	23.03.2023
Recommendation	That planning permission is refused as set out as Section 10.0 of this report.		

This application is being referred to the Planning Committee for determination by the local ward member, Councillor Tim Wendels as the Parish Council does not object to the application, and the officer’s recommendation is for refusal and for the following planning reasons:

- “the proposal (residential conversion of a building) is an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt; the submitted structural report confirms the building is capable of conversion;
- the proposed conversion will improve the look of a somewhat tatty building that is something of an eyesore – and will, it is considered, undoubtedly enhance the setting of the site and improve the amenity of the neighbouring B&B business (who are supportive);
- the design is sympathetic to, and retains the agricultural origins of, the building;
- the replacement of the existing timber stable with an oak-framed garage ensures no additional impact on the Green Belt;

- approval would be entirely consistent with how the Council has dealt with other similar proposals in the Green Belt;
- despite being in the Green Belt, the site is hardly isolated. The building is surrounded by existing development, adjacent to a convenience store (Budgens), and in walking distance to: the Spar at the petrol station; bus stops to elsewhere; and Lowdham Village centre itself – and so is considered to be in quite a sustainable location;
- the Parish Council are supportive of the proposals and there have been no objections from any other statutory consultees, or local residents.”

1.0 The Site

The site is part of a wider cluster of former farm buildings and includes a modern agricultural building whose most recent lawful use was for storage for the Gonalston Farm shop, and also a timber former stables building in the north-western corner of the site. The site is located in the Green Belt.

To the south-west of the site there is a substantial building forming the main retail part of Gonalston Farm Shop, but currently out-of-use following a fire, while to the north east there is a farmhouse with associated buildings used for bed & breakfast accommodation. Beyond the rear boundary of the site lies the car park belonging to the farm shop and then open fields.

The site is recorded as being within a Coal Authority Low Risk Area.

2.0 Relevant Planning History

19/01001/CPRIOR - Notification for Prior Approval for a Proposed Change of Use of Agricultural Building to dwellinghouse and for associated operational development. Prior approval required and refused (July 2019) on the grounds that the building had been used as a shop, and on the grounds that the extent of building works would go beyond those reasonably necessary for conversion.

04/02889/FUL – Extend farm shop into remainder of empty farm buildings – Approved 27.01.2005

01/01716/FUL – Proposed Farm Shop – Approved 11.12.2001

3.0 The Proposal

The proposal is for a change of use and for works to be carried out to the barn to create a new dwelling, and the demolition of the former stables and construction of a garage and garden store in its place. The site would be reached via the existing vehicular access and dropped kerb to the front of the site.

The proposed change of use would involve the following works:

- The north-east-facing elevation, which is currently open is to be enclosed with new walls.
- The existing timber cladding is to be replaced.

- Replacement of the metal sheeting forming the roof.
- The existing metal frame is to be repaired where necessary and repainted.
- Insertion of doors and windows to the outside of the building.
- Internal works, including the insertion of an upper floor and internal partition walls.
- The roof of the lean-to structure at the rear of the building would be removed and replaced with a balcony area.
- An opening would be created in the south-facing elevation to provide a balcony area at the front of the building.
- A white rendered finish would be applied to the lower walls of the building.
- Much of the concrete hard standing which currently covers the majority of the site would be removed. It would be replaced by either stone setts for the parking and turning areas, or by grass elsewhere on the site.

The proposal has been considered on the basis of the following plans and documents:

- Drawing titled 'Location Plan', drawing no. 22/405-01
- Drawing titled 'Block Plan', drawing no. 22/405-02A
- Drawing titled 'Existing Plans and Elevations, Barn', drawing no. 22/405-03
- Drawing titled 'Existing Plan and Elevations, Stable', drawing no. 22/405-04
- Drawing titled 'Proposed Plans and Elevations, Dwelling', drawing no. 22/405-05A
- Drawing titled 'Proposed Plans and Elevations, Cartshed', drawing no. 22/405-06
- Document titled 'Buildings at Cliff Mill Farm Bat Roost Assessment', report reference RSE_6205_R1_V1, dated June 2022
- Document titled 'Report on a Structural Assessment at The Dutch Barn, Cliff Mill Farm, Southwell Road, Gonalston, Nottingham', project no. 21-051, dated 10th June 2022
- Document titled 'Heritage Statement', dated September 2022

4.0 Departure/Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 3 properties have been individually notified by letter. A site notice has also been displayed near to the site and an advert has been placed in the local press.

A site visit was undertaken on 7th October 2022.

5.0 Planning Policy Framework

Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019)

Spatial Policy 1 - Settlement Hierarchy
 Spatial Policy 4A – Extent of the Green Belt
 Spatial Policy 4B– Green Belt Development
 Spatial Policy 7 - Sustainable Transport
 Core Policy 9 -Sustainable Design
 Core Policy 10 – Climate Change
 Core Policy 10A – Local Drainage Designations
 Core Policy 12 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
 Core Policy 13 – Landscape Character

Allocations & Development Management DPD

DM5 – Design

DM7 – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

DM10 – Pollution and Hazardous Substances

DM12 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Planning Practice Guidance (online resource)

National Design Guide – Planning practice guidance for beautiful, enduring and successful places September 2019

Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide SPD June 2021

Landscape Character Assessment SPD 2013

6.0 Consultations

Lowdham Parish Council – Do not object.

NSDC Conservation Section – Undertook a desk-based assessment of the proposal, including a review of the submitted Heritage Statement and decided that no technical advice is required.

NSDC Environmental Services – Noted the potential for agricultural use to cause contamination, and requested attachment of their standard phased contamination conditions.

NCC as Local Highway Authority – Have no objection subject to conditions requiring the following:

- Implementation of the parking and turning areas shown on the proposed block plan prior to first occupation.
- Approval of the details of any gates at the vehicle access onto Southwell Road, including a requirement that the gates are to open inwards.
- Approval of details and implementation of covered parking for 3 cycles prior to first occupation.
- Provision of an electric vehicle charging point (or if unachievable, a dummy charging point to facilitate later installation) prior to first occupation.

1 representation has been received from local residents/interested parties. The issues raised may be summarised as follows:

- Expressed support for the proposal, provided the screening louvres shown in the proposed plans were installed prior to first occupation, and retained for the lifetime of the development, so as to protect the privacy of guests using the adjacent B&B to the north-east of the site.

7.0 Comments of the Business Manager – Planning Development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the principle of a presumption in favour of sustainable development and recognises the duty under the Planning Acts for planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The NPPF refers to the presumption in favour of sustainable development being at the heart of development and sees sustainable development as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. This is confirmed at the development plan level under Policy DM12 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

Principle of Development

Spatial Policy 1 ‘Settlement Hierarchy’ of the Amended Core Strategy DPD provides the settlement hierarchy for the District. In addition, it states that, outside of Principal Villages, development will be treated differently, depending on whether it is located within designated Green Belt, as follows:

“Within the Green Belt, development will be considered against Spatial Policy 4B (Green Belt Development).”

Spatial Policy 4B ‘Green Belt Development’ of the Amended Core Strategy DPD states that, apart from development within the village envelopes of Blidworth and Lowdham, and also on Rural Affordable Housing Exceptions Sites, development will be judged according to national Green Belt policy. Since the site lies outside the above village envelopes and is not an Exception Site, national Green Belt Policy therefore applies here.

Assessing compliance with national Green Belt policy essentially involves addressing the 3 issues below:

1. Whether the proposal would represent appropriate development in the Green Belt;
2. The effect of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it; and
3. If the proposed development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.

Summary of National Green Belt Policy

National Green Belt Policy is set out in NPPF section 13 ‘Protecting Green Belt Land’, with specific guidance on assessing development proposals affecting the Green Belt provided in paragraphs 147-151.

Paragraph 147 states that ‘inappropriate development’ which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt, should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 148 directs local planning authorities to give substantial weight to any harm to the Green Belt, with ‘very special circumstances’ existing only where the potential harm to the

Green Belt and any other harm resulting from the proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 149 deals with the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt, stating that these should be regarded as inappropriate, apart from a limited list of exceptions. While noting that the application has been advanced as a re-use rather than as a new building, it is appropriate to assess whether the proposal would qualify under any of the provisions of this paragraph. In fact, the proposal does not fall under the majority of these with the potential exception of the following:

d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

and

g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

While the proposed dwelling is not materially larger than the existing barn, it would not be in the same use, and so it does not therefore qualify as appropriate development under paragraph 149 part d).

It also cannot constitute the infill or redevelopment on previously developed land (PDL) allowed under paragraph 149 part g) as PDL explicitly excludes agricultural land.

NPPF para. 150 gives an additional list of forms of development which it states are also 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt, provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposal does not fall under the majority of these, however part d) "the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction" requires closer consideration (see assessment below):

Is the Proposal Appropriate Development in the Green Belt?

The applicant has submitted a structural inspection report from a firm of engineering consultants. This reaches a number of conclusions, including the following:

- That the blockwork walls are in good condition. The rear wall has cracking, but this wall is considered to effectively be cladding and non-structural.
- That some minor repairs are needed to the structural steel frame.
- Foundations and floors appear to be adequate.
- The overall building structure is considered as robust and presently fit for purpose.

- That any applied weights for new ceilings, services and lighting should be supported on the blockwork walls, not the steel frame.
- The roof sheeting should be replaced with new cladding materials.
- New roof cladding material weights should be equal or less than the currently installed cladding materials.

While the above report concludes that 'The Dutch Barn is considered to be in suitable structural condition for conversion into a single dwelling as proposed', this is an engineer's assessment of the condition of the existing structural elements (i.e. the steel frame, foundations and floors), not an assessment of compliance with Green Belt planning policy.

Meeting the requirements of para 150 d) also requires the proposed development to fall under what might reasonably be regarded as 're-use' of a building. No precise definition is given of this phrase in the NPPF or the government's Planning Practice Guidance, but it is clear that it must be different from 'replacement', as the requirements for this type of development are dealt with separately under para 149 d). The fact that the eastern elevation is currently completely open means that the existing building is unsuitable for use as a dwelling without significant changes to its structure i.e. above what would ordinarily be accepted/undertaken as a conversion. Indeed, the proposal under consideration involves the following:

- The construction of a new wall (with openings) to enclose the whole eastern elevation of the building.
- Replacement of the roof.
- Removal of the internal walls above ground floor level.
- Replacement of the timber cladding which forms the upper part of the south-east facing wall, and the majority of the outer surface of the south-west facing wall.

In other words, a substantial amount of the external walls and all of the roof of the proposed dwelling would in fact be new. The parts of the existing building to be retained would be limited to the metal frame, the lower parts of the external and internal walls, and the upper parts of the external walls where these are not being removed to introduce windows. It is therefore considered that the proposal would effectively involve a 're-building' rather than a 're-use', and it is therefore considered that the proposal falls outside the provisions of para 150 d).

Next, considering the demolition of the existing stables and construction of a garage/store – I note that these works are described as a 'replacement' in paragraph 4.4 of the Heritage Statement accompanying the application. This part of the proposal therefore needs to be considered under paragraph 149 d).

) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

The existing stables building has a footprint of approximately 13.4m by 5.7m and is approximately 3.8m high. The proposed garage/store would have an 11.2m by 5.8m footprint and would be approximately 4.6m high. Given that the slight increase in height would be offset by the reduction in footprint, and that the siting of the new building would essentially be the same as the old, it is reasonable to regard this as a replacement, that is not materially

larger. However, the existing use of the building is as a stable and not within the curtilage of a dwelling where the use change from a stable to a garage might be considered to be incidental. Therefore, the new building would not be in the same (equestrian) use, meaning that it does not meet this requirement for replacement buildings in paragraph 149 d) either.

Effect of the Development on the Openness of the Green Belt

Notwithstanding the above assessment that the development comprises inappropriate development, it is also reasonable to consider whether the proposed use would preserve the openness of the Green Belt. Openness is the absence of development notwithstanding the degree of visibility of the land in question from the public realm and has both spatial and visual aspects.

In this case, although the proposal does not involve a spatial increase (i.e. an increase in the physical volume of the proposed buildings), there would be associated impacts from the presence of domestic paraphernalia, much of which could not be controlled with conditions such as clothes lines, garden furniture, barbeques etc. This would have impact upon the openness of the Green Belt..

As noted above, inappropriate development should not be approved except where very special circumstances exist which clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt and any other harm resulting from the proposal. No very special circumstances have been put forward which might outweigh the fact that the proposal is considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and none are considered to exist (see discussion of the other aspects of the proposal in detail below). In view of the above, it is considered that the proposal does not accord with Spatial Policy 4B or with Section 13 of the NPPF.

Impact on the Visual Amenities of the Area

Core Policy 9 'Sustainable Design' of the Amended Core Strategy DPD requires new development proposals to, amongst other things, "achieve a high standard of sustainable design and layout that is capable of being accessible to all and of an appropriate form and scale to its context complementing the existing built and landscape environments". In accordance with Core Policy 9, all proposals for new development are assessed with reference to Policy DM5 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD, which, amongst other things, require new development to reflect the rich local distinctiveness of the District's landscape and character through scale, form, mass, layout, design, materials and detailing.

Core Policy 13 'Landscape Character' of the Amended Core Strategy DPD states that the Council will work to secure development which protects and enhances the District's landscapes.

The site is located approximately 75m away from the grade II Listed Cliff Mill to the north-west of the site. There are a number of buildings intervening, and so the proposal would not affect the setting of this designated heritage asset.

The existing building has clearly been in place for some time, and the most obvious effects of age on its appearance are seen in corrosion of the corrugated metal roof, and in paint peeling from the upper part of the front gable. The effects of aging on the timber cladding are not

harmful, and although there is cracking in the blockwork of the lower walls, and in brickwork at the rear, this can only be seen from within the site and from relatively close up, and is not generally harmful. While it is not an attractive building, its timber cladding, neutral colours and typical design means that it does not look out of place, or otherwise attract the eye in its setting in the open countryside.

The proposal would result in some improvements to the appearance of the site – as indicated above the existing corroded sheeting on the roof would be replaced, and render applied to the blockwork on the lower parts of the walls. In addition, the majority of the unbuilt part of the site is currently occupied by concrete hard standing – this would mostly be replaced by a mixture of stone setts and grass which could be argued as a visual improvement (noting that its current context is as an agricultural building and yard), albeit one which would not be particularly prominent or even visible from public vantage points outside the site.

The retention of most of the original silhouette, the corrugated roof and the use of renewed timber cladding would retain some of the original agricultural look of the building. Despite this, some aspects of the design are considered to be less than appealing in their visual impact. In particular, I note that the structural metal frame of the building would partially obscure the first floor windows in the west- and east- facing elevations. This could possibly prevent windows opening and even if this is not the case, it is hard to see this particular feature as being anything other than an example of poor and contrived design.

However the use of white render, and the introduction of new features such as the large windows and balcony at the front would create a building which would be neither attractive nor unobtrusive, forming an incongruous feature on the street and in the landscape which would be more likely to be noticed and, in effect, “draw attention to itself”.

This is, in part, a result of decisions made during the design of the building, including the decision to include non-agricultural and domestic features in the most prominent elevation facing the road to the south –particularly the substantial windows and balcony.

The Council’s Landscape Character Assessment SPD identifies the site as lying within the ‘Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands’ Regional Character Area, and within the ‘Epperstone Village Farmlands with Ancient Woodlands’ Policy Zone. The actions identified for this zone as regards the built environment are to conserve and enhance its rural character by concentrating new development around the existing settlements of Southwell and Halloughton and also to conserve the local built vernacular and reinforce this in new development.

As discussed above, the proposal is considered to be effectively a new-build rather than a re-use, and the site is not located within or adjacent to either of the above settlements.

The existing building is a modern barn which is not representative of the local built vernacular, so there is no particular advantage (in landscape character terms) in conserving it, and the proposed changes to its appearance do not reinforce the local built vernacular in any way either. As discussed above, it is considered that the proposal would appear incongruous and more noticeable and obtrusive than the existing building. In view of the above, it is

considered that the proposal would therefore fail to conserve and enhance the character of the local landscape.

It is considered that, given the similarities in scale, design and materials, that construction of the new garage in place of the existing stables would be essentially neutral in its visual impact.

In view of the above, it is considered that the proposal would have a harmful visual impact and that it therefore fails to accord with Core Policies 9 and 13.

Impact upon Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 'Design' of the Allocations and Development Management DPD states that separation distances from neighbouring development should be sufficient to ensure that neither suffers from an unacceptable reduction in amenity including overbearing impacts, loss of light and privacy. It also states that development proposals should have regard to their impact on the amenity or operation of surrounding land uses and where necessary mitigate for any detrimental impact.

The proposal involves works which would not increase the dimensions of the building. It would not therefore harm the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings through being overbearing or causing an unacceptable loss of light.

The only buildings in residential use close to the site are Cliff House and Cliff Mill Farm House to the east, including the cluster of associated buildings used for bed and breakfast accommodation. The east-facing side elevation of the proposed new dwelling would be set back approximately 15m from the outdoor amenity space belonging to the B&B, and a minimum of approximately 20m from the buildings themselves. This is considered to be a sufficient separation distance and that any loss of privacy would remain within acceptable limits. The louvres included in the proposed plans are therefore a welcome feature, but not one considered to be strictly necessary for privacy reasons. For this reason I have not recommended the attachment of conditions requiring that the louvres be installed prior to first occupation, or that they be maintained in place for the lifetime of the development.

It is likely that the proposed residential use might result in a reduction in noise from vehicles accessing the site when compared with retail storage. A modest improvement in the residential amenity of neighbours in this respect might therefore be expected.

Although parts of the metal frame of the building would sit just outside the first floor windows in the west- and east- facing elevations, this is considered to be an aesthetically poor design decision, rather than something which would make conditions for future occupants inadequate because of lack of light or outlook.

All of the habitable rooms in the proposed new dwelling are therefore considered to be of an adequate size with satisfactory amounts of natural light and an acceptable outlook.

Overall there would be an adequate amount of outdoor amenity space, however it should be noted that this space is somewhat compromised by having to share the parking and turning area with the private garden and so the useable space is diminished somewhat. The less-

than-ideal quality of the outdoor amenity space is not however considered to provide sufficient grounds for a refusal.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to be in accord with Policy DM5.

Impact upon Highway Safety

Spatial Policy 7 requires development proposals to be appropriate for the highway network, and to ensure that the safety, convenience and free flow of traffic using the highway are not adversely affected.

Policy DM5 'Design' states that provision should be made for safe and inclusive access to new development.

I note that the Local Highway Authority have raised no objections to the proposal, subject to the attachment of conditions relating to the timing of parking provision, the details of the gate and to provision for cycle parking and electric charging. These conditions are considered to be reasonable, and so with these attached, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Spatial Policy 7, Policy DM5.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Core Policy 9 'Sustainable Design' states that new development will be expected to demonstrate a high standard of sustainable design, setting out a number of specific requirements, including the pro-active management of surface water.

Core Policy 10 'Climate Change' states that the Council is committed to tackling the causes and impacts of climate change, including through steering new development away from those areas at highest risk of flooding, and also through ensuring that new development positively manages its surface water run-off to ensure that there is no unacceptable impact in run-off into surrounding areas or the existing drainage regime.

The proposal is located in Flood Zone 1, and is not therefore at increased risk of fluvial flooding. Furthermore, it is not in an area identified as being at risk of surface water flooding.

The proposal would not result in an increased part of the site becoming built-over, in fact some of the concrete hard standing currently in place would be removed and replaced by a permeable surface in the form of grass. In addition, the applicant has stated on the application form that surface water would be disposed of to a soakaway. Compliance with the Building Regulations is therefore considered to be sufficient to ensure that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

The proposal would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding and would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and is therefore considered to comply with Core Policies 9 and 10.

Impact upon Ecology

Core Policy 12 of the Amended Core Strategy DPD deals with Biodiversity and Green

Infrastructure and states that the Council will seek to secure development that maximises the opportunities to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity.

Policy DM5 (Design) of the Allocations & Development Management DPD states (in part 5) that natural features of importance (including protected species) within or adjacent to development sites should, wherever possible, be protected and enhanced.

Policy DM7 of the Allocations & Development Management DPD deals with Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, requiring new development to protect, promote and enhance green infrastructure.

The applicant has submitted a Bat Roost Assessment dated June 2022 with the application. This report assessed both buildings on the site as having negligible potential for roosting by bats, and found no evidence of nesting birds either. It recommends that the inclusion of bird boxes would provide a cost-effective biodiversity enhancement. I consider this to be reasonable. With a condition requiring provision of bird boxes attached, the proposal would therefore be in accordance with Core Policy 12 and Policies DM5, DM7.

Pollution and Land Contamination

Policy DM10 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD states that where a site is known, or is highly likely to have been contaminated by a previous use, investigation of this and proposals for any necessary mitigation should form part of the proposal for re-development. Where contamination comes to light as part of the development process, the proposal will be determined in light of this.

I note the concerns of the Council's Environmental Services section regarding the potential for land contamination at the site, and their request that a pre-commencement condition be attached to any approval granted. Given that the site was previously part of a working farm, I consider this request to be reasonable.

Is the Proposal Sustainable Development?

In paragraphs 7 and 8, the NPPF defines the purpose of the planning system as being to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, with this having three interdependent, overarching objectives as follows:

- a) **an economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social

and cultural well-being; and

- c) **an environmental objective** – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

With the above in mind, it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted to establish that the site would not be required at a future date by Gonalston Farm Shop – potentially conflicting with the above economic objective and could lead to pressure to erect a new storage building in the Green Belt, which it is potentially odds with the purposes of Green Belt policy.

The proposed new dwelling would be located outside of any existing settlement. Although it is located relatively close to the edge of Lowdham, with bus services running along the Southwell Road, and some facilities in the form of the farm shop and the petrol station to the south-west are available near-by. It would nevertheless be in a location where in practice future occupants would be likely to be reliant on the use of a private car for access to facilities and services.

This means that it would fail to protect and enhance the natural environment, as well as failing to support strong and vibrant communities. It would not therefore meet either the environmental or the social objectives in this respect.

As described above, it is considered that the proposal would fail to create a well-designed, beautiful place for future occupants to live in, once again failing to meet the social objective.

As described above, the existing buildings on the site are unsuitable for residential use, and so the proposed new dwelling would in effect result from re-building not re-use, once again failing to meet the environmental objective.

The proposal is not therefore considered as being sustainable development, as defined by the NPPF.

8.0 Implications

In writing this report and in putting forward recommendations officers have considered the following implications; Data Protection, Equality and Diversity, Financial, Human Rights, Legal, Safeguarding, Sustainability, and Crime and Disorder and where appropriate they have made reference to these implications and added suitable expert comment where appropriate.

9.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and its visual impact would also be harmful, both to the openness of the Green Belt, and also to the character and appearance of the area. Assigning substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt, as directed by the NPPF, very special circumstances are required to outweigh the above harm. . Although the

proposal would make a modest contribution of a single dwelling to the District's housing needs, the Council is able to demonstrate that it has a 5-year housing land supply and this is not considered to outweigh the harm and conflict with policy identified above. There are no very special circumstances in the form of other Development Plan policies or material considerations which might outweigh the above, and the proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

10.0 Reason for Refusal

01

The site is located within the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt. Spatial Policy 4B of the Amended Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2019) requires development in the Green Belt to be determined in line with national planning policy (National Planning Policy Framework) (NPPF)). In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development would comprise a new build, rather than a re-use, by virtue of the amount of construction required to enable a dwellinghouse to be provided on site. The existing building is open at one side, requiring a new wall and openings to be constructed; the existing roofing material would be replaced. The development therefore fails to comply with paragraph 150 part d) of the NPPF. The development does not comply with any of the other exceptions provided within the NPPF. Furthermore, the proposed garage would replace a stables building which is of a similar size and siting but in a different use, falling outside the provisions of NPPF paragraph 149 part d) for replacement buildings. The proposal is therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which by definition is harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. No very special circumstances that would outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt have been advanced and none are considered to exist. The development is therefore contrary to the relevant provisions within the NPPF and Spatial Policy 4B as set out above.

02

It is considered that the proposed new dwelling, by virtue of its location and detailing of the proposed design would result in a development that would fail to respond to its rural context, which is one of conserve and enhance, and is thus of an awkward and unattractive design which would appear highly prominent, incongruous and obtrusive in its context, causing harm to the character and appearance of the rural area. Overall, it would cause harm to visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt as a result of its more pronounced visual impact.

The proposed development is therefore contrary to Spatial Policy 4B (Green Belt Development), Core Policy 9 (Sustainable Design), Core Policy 13 (Landscape Character) and Policy DM5 (Design), Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document and fails to have regard to section 13 (Protecting Green Belt Land) of the NPPF.

Informatives

01

You are advised that as of 1st December 2011, the Newark and Sherwood Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule came into effect. Whilst the above application has

been refused by the Local Planning Authority you are advised that CIL applies to all planning permissions granted on or after this date. Thus any successful appeal against this decision may therefore be subject to CIL (depending on the location and type of development proposed). Full details are available on the Council's website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/

02

The application is clearly contrary to the Development Plan and other material planning considerations, as detailed in the above reason(s) for refusal. Working positively and proactively with the applicants would not have afforded the opportunity to overcome these problems, giving a false sense of hope and potentially incurring the applicants further unnecessary time and/or expense.

03

For the avoidance of doubt, the application has been refused on the basis of the following plans and supporting documents:

- (i) Application form, received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th August 2022.
- (ii) Drawing titled Location Plan, drawing no. 22/405-01, received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th August 2022.
- (iii) Drawing titled Block Plan, drawing no. 22/405-02A, received by the Local Planning Authority on 21st September 2022.
- (iv) Drawing titled Existing Plans and Elevations, Barn, drawing no. 22/405-03, received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th August 2022.
- (v) Drawing titled Existing Plan and Elevations, Stable, drawing no. 22/405-04, received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th August 2022.
- (vi) Drawing titled Proposed Plans and Elevations, Dwelling, drawing no. 22/405-05A, received by the Local Planning Authority on 21st September 2022.
- (vii) Drawing titled Proposed Plans and Elevations, Cartshed, drawing no. 22/405-06, received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th August 2022.
- (viii) Document titled Buildings at Cliff Mill Farm Bat Roost Assessment, report reference RSE_6205_R1_V1, dated June 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th August 2022.
- (ix) Document titled Report on a Structural Assessment at The Dutch Barn, Cliff Mill Farm, Southwell Road, Gonalston, Nottingham, project no. 21-051, dated 10th June 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on 18th August 2022.
- (x) Document titled Heritage Statement, dated September 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on 15th September 2022.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Application case file

Committee Plan - 22/01637/FUL

