

PLANNING COMMITTEE 8 MAY 2025

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
5 24/01810/FUL	Cllr Saddington	30.04.2025	Raises the point of landownership and the legitimacy of farming operations. Suggests that it is not a farming operation and the buildings have been bought to develop non-agricultural operations such as storage.	<p>Following a detailed review of land ownership of the land register titles forming the application site and those adjoining, it is evident that the applicant does own the application site and adjoining land to form an agricultural holding.</p> <p>The land ownership certificate submitted with the application is therefore correct.</p> <p>The associated committee report considers the merits of the proposed Use Class B8 Storage Use and assesses the proposed development against the relevant development plan policies together with all other material considerations.</p>
5 24/01810/FUL	Late representation - Luke Hatton	30.04.2025	"Supports the changes made to Flaggs farm as its tidied the area up and has been well thought out in regard to the specific routes for transportation to minimise disruption to nearby villages".	Comments to note. These matters are already considered in the committee report and planning balance.
5 24/01810/FUL	Late representation - Chris Germany	30.04.2025	"...writing add my full support to this application. As a local farmer in the village and previous tenant of the buildings now owned by the applicant, I wholeheartedly support the proposed change of use. The site now looks fantastic, so much more aesthetically pleasing and to see life back again at the farm can only be a good thing. The countryside needs to evolve, not die and a location such as this is perfect for this kind of business and helps employment locally.	Comments to note. These matters are already considered in the committee report and planning balance.

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			Despite comments to the contrary, the access road has never been a single track road and as far as I'm aware vehicles accessing the site would not come through Norwell or Caunton and would not impact the villages. The applicant should be congratulated on turning a dilapidated farm back into working use and deserves full support for his application."	
6 24/01621/FUL	Caythorpe Parish Council	1.5.2025	<p>Comments received to clarify position (objecting to the proposal):</p> <p>1. The parish council has consistently objected to the application, in its current form. There is some sympathy and positive feeling in the village towards the pub, but it is far outweighed by concern and opposition to their plans for expansion of their outdoor events offering. Just because we have reflected both sides does not mean we have been neutral and every submission has included a statement of our objection. We would like this corrected.</p> <p>2. The positive responses to the planning application are listed in a way that suggests they are both more numerous and reflective of the balance of local opinion. As discussed, these were obtained via a social media campaign that included publishing a planning response from a Lowdham resident</p>	<p>1. It is noted in the body of the report at paragraph 9.6 that the Parish object to the proposed structure, however it is acknowledged the comments in the consultee section summarise the comments as neither objecting or supporting the proposal. The Parish contacted me to confirm the comments should be taken as an OBJECTION to the proposal (and not neutral).</p> <p>2. The LPA is aware that the majority of the comments in support of the proposal are not from local residents but from residents of the wider locality, around Nottinghamshire and some further afield. This is acknowledged but does not mean that the comments should not be taken into account. The 40 objections are mostly from local residents in Caythorpe.</p>

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>which then attracted a number of unpleasant comments until they, sensibly, took it down. Lots of the supportive responses are from patrons who live some distance from the pub and are not going to be affected by the noise pollution and traffic associated with it. Whilst they are entitled to express their support, they do not have the skin in the game that villagers do. We would like the origin of these comments clarified/emphasised in the text.</p> <p>3. The report concludes with a, somewhat reluctant, recommendation for refusal based on the flood issues. However, the other major points of concern that form the basis for most local objections are treated quite lightly. The noise impact assessment has already established that the sound pollution emanating from the venue (on a quiet weekday with a broken speaker system) would exceed legal thresholds without mitigation. None of the interventions suggested have been voluntarily implemented since this report was produced. As you made clear, ironically, because the outdoor space does not have planning permission, you cannot impose conditions on the venue and only Environmental Health can respond to complaints. You also mention that the roof structure will probably be used with the sides open and have little sound-dampening property</p>	<p>3. Detail on noise mitigation has not been discussed to date due to the recommendation to refuse the application, and the comments from the Environmental Health that a condition could be included (if approved) to require noise mitigation measures to be submitted and agreed. These measures would not prevent noise but would ensure levels were acceptable in terms of impact on amenity. Other conditions could be included to limit the number of events held within the year, and include time restrictions for outdoor live music (to avoid loud music at unsociable hours). It is noted that this is the same approach the LPA took in relation to noise on the previous refusal (24/00650/FUL).</p>

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>(contrary to what the applicant has said in previous communications). Stating that a noise condition would be imposed if planning were granted doesn't even come close to reflecting the complexity of that process (and the planning issues inherent in acoustic fencing, for example). Our current position is that it would not be possible to avoid a significant, negative impact on our quiet community. The same is true of the increase in traffic volume. As also mentioned, comparable reasoning lead to rejection of the planning permission at Mill Farm, a few hundred metres away, and it would appear curious if the outcome were different here. It was encouraging to hear that conditions may also include limitations on occupancy and frequency of events, but detail has been light to date.</p> <p>We feel that we have operated in good faith and have carefully reflected the balance of opinion in the village. However, creating a business model that is dependent on high occupancy of an outdoor party space in a small, rural community was always a plan likely to run into trouble. Despite that, we would still like to work constructively on this issue and welcome any opportunity for dialogue with the applicant. All-or-nothing seems like the worst of both worlds. Ripping out the lovely garden space and</p>	

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			playground, grassing over the, clearly helpful, car park, and shuttering the business would be no more preferable than having a two-hundred person wedding every Saturday afternoon, in my personal opinion. Some thoughtful compromise is needed.	
6 24/01621/FUL	Lowdham Parish Council	2.5.2025	<p>Lowdham Parish Council has been approached by a number of residents who are concerned that if the plans are approved there would be resultant unwelcome noise disturbing the peace, especially during the summer months, that will be heard by residents living at that side of the village.</p> <p>Members wish to support its residents in helping to prevent any unwelcome noise.</p> <p>Lowdham PC has not been consulted but nevertheless would like to register its objection, without an assurance that anticipated excessive noise will be abated.</p>	Objection noted. Concerns regarding noise are discussed in the body of the report and if the application was to be approved, conditions could be attached to mitigate noise impact (see above comments and report).
7 25/00512/PIP	Additional neighbour comment	27.4.25	<p>(Summary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need to keep as much of a buffer as possible between properties on Beacon Hill and the nature reserve.• Green space behind properties has not	<p>Comments noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regarding a buffer, if approved, any landscaping and layout would be assessed at Technical Details Stage.• Agree that a small scale development (1-

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>been used for years and for wildlife is extension of nature reserve – would be better to stick with 1 dwelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• If permission in principle approved, suggest no more than 2 dwellings• If full application is received, suggest conditions are put in place to ensure that remainder of site is kept as green space, with trees and hedgerows preserved, no lighting etc to minimise impact on wildlife.	<p>2 dwellings) would be preferable, however 2-4 dwellings has been submitted for assessment and has been concluded acceptable in principle (subject to scale, layout, design which would be assessed at Technical Details Consent).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conditions can be attached to the Technical Details Consent application as suggested - landscaping etc would be considered and would likely be secured by condition if approved.