



Bassetlaw
DISTRICT COUNCIL
— North Nottinghamshire —

Planning Committee

Agenda

Meeting to be held at The Assembly Room,
Worksop Town Hall, S80 2AH
On Wednesday, 24th April, 2024
At 6.30 pm

Please turn mobile telephones to silent during meetings. In case of emergency, Members/Officers can be contacted on the Council's mobile telephone: 07940 001 705. In accordance with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, audio/visual recording and photography during Council meetings is permitted in accordance with the Council's protocol 'Filming of Public Meetings'.

Planning Committee

Membership: 2023-24

Councillors: N J Sanders, S Fielding, C Adams, J Bowker, H M Brand, D Challinor, M Charlesworth, G Dinsdale, G Freeman, F McFarland, G A N Oxby and D G Pidwell.

Substitute Members: None

Quorum: 3 Members

Lead Officer for this Meeting

J Krawczyk

Administrator for this Meeting

L Thompson

Planning Committee

Wednesday, 24th April, 2024

Agenda

1. Apologies
2. Declarations of Interest
 - a. Members
 - b. Officers
3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 6th March 2024 (Pages 5 - 10)
4. Minutes of Planning Consultation Group Meetings held on:
 - a. 4th March 2024 (Pages 11 - 14)
 - b. 18th March 2024 (Pages 15 - 20)
 - c. 2nd April 2024 (Pages 21 - 26)
5. Outstanding Minutes List (Pages 27 - 28)

Section A - Items for discussion in public

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

6. Report(s) of the Head of Planning and Place

Public Interest Test

Ms. B. Alderton-Sambrook, Head of Planning and Place, has deemed that all items on the agenda are not confidential.

Appeal Decision(s)

- a. Appeal Decision: APP/A3010/W/23/3330278 - Olive Tree Camping and Caravans, Main Street, Clarborough DN22 9NJ (Pages 29 - 38)

Planning Application(s) and Associated Items

- b. Planning Application: 23/00696/COU - Strawberry Fields Land Off A631, Beckingham, South Yorkshire (Pages 39 - 56)

Exempt Information Items

The press and public are likely to be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

Section B - Items for discussion in private

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

7. Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

Notes:

1. The papers enclosed with this Agenda are available in large print if required.
2. Copies can be requested by contacting us on 01909 533 232 or by e-mail laura.thompson@bassetlaw.gov.uk

Planning Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday, 6th March, 2024 at The Ceres Suite, Worksop Town Hall, S80 2AH

Present: Councillor N J Sanders (Chairman)

Councillors:

S Fielding	C Adams
H M Brand	D Challinor
M Charlesworth	G Dinsdale
G Freeman	F McFarland
G A N Oxby	D G Pidwell

Officers: B Alderton-Sambrook, J Krawczyk, L Thompson and E Wallace.

(The meeting opened at 6.30 pm.)

61 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J Bowker.

62 Declarations of Interest

62a Members

Councillor S J Fielding declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in:

Item 6(a) – Planning Application: 23/01313/CTP

- Apple Barn, Great North Road, Gamston, Nottinghamshire DN22 0PY

Item 6(b) – Planning Application: 23/00854/FUL

- Apple Barn, Great North Road, Gamston, Nottinghamshire DN22 0PY

Councillor Fielding left the meeting for the duration and determination of these items.

Councillor G Dinsdale declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in:

Item 6(a) – Planning Application: 23/01313/CTP

- Apple Barn, Great North Road, Gamston, Nottinghamshire DN22 0PY

Item 6(b) – Planning Application: 23/00854/FUL

- Apple Barn, Great North Road, Gamston, Nottinghamshire DN22 0PY

Councillor Dinsdale remained in the meeting.

Councillor F McFarland declared a Non-Pecuniary Interest in:

Item 6(d) – Planning Application: 23/01444/FUL – Land off Rayton Lane, Osberton, Worksop, Nottinghamshire

Councillor McFarland remained in the meeting.

62b Officers

PLANNING COMMITTEE

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

63 Minutes of the Meeting held on 7th February 2024

Resolved that the Minutes of the meeting held on 7th February 2024 be approved.

64 Minutes of Planning Consultation Group Meetings held on:

64a 29th January 2024

Resolved that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group held on 29th January 2024 be received.

64b 5th February 2024

Resolved that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group held on 5th February 2024 be received.

64c 19th February 2024

Resolved that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group held on 19th February 2024 be received.

65 Outstanding Minutes List

Resolved that the Outstanding Minutes List be received.

Section A - Items for discussion in public

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

Public Interest Test

The Head of Planning and Place, determined that all items on the agenda are non-confidential.

66 Report(s) of the Head of Planning and Place

Planning Application(s) and Associated Items

66a Planning Application: 23/01313/CTP - Apple Barn, Great North Road, Gamston, Nottinghamshire DN22 0PY

Members were advised that permission was being sought, for an application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the creation of hardstanding area for the landing and take-off of a personally owned helicopter.

The site was not subject to a site visit prior to the meeting.

The Planning Development Manager presented the application. Members were presented with a location map and site plan layout for consideration.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The application was not publicised as there is no statutory requirement to do so. However, the application is accessible to the public via the Bassetlaw District Council Public Access page. In response to which 20 public comments were received in objection to the application. These comments are detailed in the report.

Member's questions and comments were addressed by the Planning Development Manager.

In conclusion, the Chairman summarised the debate.

Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Place: Grant Certificate of Lawful Development.

Committee Decision Resolved that: Grant Certificate of Lawful Development.

66b Planning Application: 23/00854/FUL - Apple Barn, Great North Road, Gamston, Nottinghamshire DN22 0PY

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for the removal of existing stable block and replace with a temporary building to store a private helicopter for 24 months and the existing stable base to be re-used for a storage building.

The site was not subject to a visit prior to the meeting.

The Planning Development Manager presented the application. Members were presented with a location map, site plan layout and photographs for consideration.

Responses from statutory consultees were detailed in the report.

Member's questions and comments were addressed by the Planning Development Manager.

In conclusion, the Chairman summarised the debate.

Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Place: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Committee Decision Resolved that: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

66c Planning Application: 23/00946/OUT - Land North of Ollerton Road, Tuxford, Nottinghamshire

Members were advised of an outline application with some matters reserved (access) seeking permission for a proposed commercial development of existing agricultural land (a re-submission of 22/00821/OUT.)

The site was not subject to a visit prior to the meeting.

The Planning Development Manager presented the application. Members were presented with a location map, site plan layout and site photographs for consideration.

Responses from statutory consultees were detailed in the report.

In accordance with the rules of procedure for public participation, Daniel Walker spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Member's questions and comments were addressed by the Planning Development Manager and Head of Planning and Place.

In conclusion, the Chairman summarised the debate.

Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Place: Refuse Planning Permission.

Formal vote:

For: 4	D Challinor, S Fielding, G Freeman and N Sanders.
Against: 6	C Adams, H M Brand, M Charlesworth, G Dinsdale, F McFarland and G A N Oxby.
Abstain: 1	D G Pidwell.

Committee Decision resolved that: To overturn the officer recommendation and grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Members discussed potential conditions and the Planning Development Manager advised that the standard set of planning conditions would be imposed.

An elected Member proposed an additional condition to ensure that the site would be developed in accordance with the indicative site plan. The proposal was seconded and Members took a vote on the condition.

Committee Decision Resolved that: The additional condition be agreed.

An elected Member proposed the implementation of a S106 Agreement including the planning obligations detailed in the report that had been relayed from statutory consultees. This proposal was seconded and Members took a vote.

Committee Decision Resolved that: A S106 Agreement be agreed.

66d Planning Application: 23/01444/FUL - Land Off Rayton Lane, Osberton, Worksop, Nottinghamshire

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for a proposed solar farm to produce up to 34MW of renewable energy at land off Rayton Lane, Osberton, Worksop.

The site was not subject to a site visit prior to the meeting.

The Planning Development Manager presented the application. Members were presented with a location map, site plan layout and site photographs for consideration.

Responses from statutory consultees were detailed in the report.

In accordance with the rules of procedure for public participation, Tessa Fletcher spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

Member's questions and comments were addressed by the Planning Development Manager and Head of Planning and Place.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

In conclusion, the Chairman summarised the debate.

Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Place: Grant permission subject to conditions.

Committee Decision Resolved that: Grant permission subject to conditions.

Exempt Information Items

Section B - Items for discussion in private

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

67 Any other business which the Chair considers to be urgent

As there was no other urgent business, the Chairman closed the meeting.

(Meeting closed at 8.29 pm.)

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Consultation Group

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 4th March 2024 via MS Teams

Present Councillors: H Brand, S Fielding, F McFarland and N Sanders.

Officers in attendance: J Krawczyk and L Thompson.

(Meeting opened at 3:58 pm).

64. Apologies

There were no apologies for absence received.

65. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

66. Planning Applications

Ref. No.	Description
24/00003/VOC	Variation of condition 12 to allow changes in windows to PVC to Plots 1, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Land Opposite Holly House, High Street, East Markham.

Members were advised the application sought to vary condition 12 to allow changes in windows to PVC to plots 1, 5, 6, 7 and 9.

Timber windows have been installed in the other 3 plots but the applicant is having difficulty sourcing further timber windows due to issues with the supply chain.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

East Markham Parish Council and one member of the public have raised an objection as they feel that the windows should be uniform across the development.

The Conservation Team have not raised any concerns.

Officer satisfied the proposed PVC windows are a close enough match to the approved timber windows and therefore will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area.

Officer recommendation – Grant variation of conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
22/00691/VOC	Variation of Condition Number 2 and 8 of Application and Removal of Condition 3 of 19/00941/FUL Condition 2 Minor Variations to the Elevations and Plans as Result of Work on Site and Condition 8 Additional Hardstanding Area to be Brought Forward for Increased Parking Provision on Site to Service Development.

Middleton's Yard, Potter Street, Worksop.

Members were advised the application sought to vary conditions 2 and 8 and remove condition 3 of 19/00941/FUL to allow minor variations to elevations and plans as a result of work on site and additional hardstanding area to be brought forward for increased parking provision on site to service development.

The application was being referred to PCG as it was submitted by Bassetlaw District Council.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The Conservation Team are satisfied with the variation and removal of conditions.

Highways have raised no objection subject to a condition ensuring that the one way vehicular access into the site continues to be adhered to at certain hours.

Officer satisfied with the variation and removal of conditions and is of the opinion that the development has positively impacted the surrounding area.

Officer recommendation – Grant variation of conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
23/01421/ADV	3m x 2m Political PVC Banner. Labour Hall, New Street, Retford.

Members were advised the application had since been withdrawn by the applicant and therefore would not be discussed at PCG.

Ref. No.	Description
24/00031/COU	Change of Use of Land from Agricultural to Equestrian. Land Fronting Big Lane, Clarborough.

Members were advised that the application sought to change the use of land from agricultural to equestrian at the land fronting big lane in Clarborough. The site is bounded by hedgerows and has a public footpath running diagonally across the site.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Clarborough and Welham Parish Council have objected to the application citing the following concerns:

- Dog-walkers using the footpath whilst horses are roaming free.
- Stabling and other equestrian paraphernalia following in due course.
- The access gate is collapsed.
- Boundary lengths of the site need strengthening.

Rights of Way have no objections so long as the public footpath remains open and available to use, it would be an offence to block this.

Members were advised that it is the responsibility of dog-owners to keep their dogs on a lead.

Officer advised that two conditions can be imposed to protect the site from further development. The first will prevent moveable structures being erected on the site and the second will remove permitted development rights for boundary treatment.

Officer satisfied the change of use is acceptable as there will not be a detrimental impact on the character of the landscape and the conditions imposed will protect the openness of the countryside.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

67. Any other business which the Chairman considers to be urgent

As there was no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting.

(Meeting ended at 4:21pm).

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Consultation Group

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 18th March 2024 via MS Teams

Present Councillors: D Challinor, S Fielding, and N Sanders.

Officers in attendance: A Broadhead, J Krawczyk and L Thompson.

(Meeting opened at 4:00pm).

68. Apologies

There were no apologies for absence received.

69. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

70. Planning Applications

Ref. No.	Description
24/00134/FUL	Erection of a Polytunnel Extension to the Rear of the Building, Extension of the Site to the East, Demolition of the Existing Covered Sales Area to the Front of the Building, Revised Parking Arrangements, New Compost Area, Security Fencing and Removal of an Existing Polytunnel. Retford and Gainsborough Garden Centre, Bar Road, Beckingham.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to erect a polytunnel extension to the rear of the building, an extension of the site to the east, demolish the existing covered sales area to the front of the building, revise parking arrangements, create a new compost area, erect security fencing and remove an existing polytunnel.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The Parish Council have expressed their supported for the application.

A neighbouring property has raised an objection citing concerns regarding the existing café area, erosion of privacy, increased noise and disturbance and the lack of hedgerow screening.

Officer advised the existing café is not considered as part of this application and there are mature trees adjacent to the café and the neighbouring property that has raised the objection.

Officer satisfied the proposed works will not generate substantial noise or disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
----------	-------------

24/00011/HSE Demolition of an Existing Converted Outbuilding and Erection of Single Storey Rear and Side Extension.

25 Alma Road, Retford.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to demolish an existing converted outbuilding and erect a single storey rear and side extension.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

A neighbouring property has raised an objection citing concerns regarding reduction in natural light, damp and maintenance issues.

Officer satisfied the proposal is modest in scale and design so there will not be any additional overshadowing. Potential damp related issues are not a material planning consideration but this can be avoided as plans would need to meet building regulations. The proposal will be set off the boundary by 1 metre allowing room for general maintenance of the property.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
23/01499/VOC	Variation of Condition 2 on P/A 19/01020/LBA to Allow Changes to the Approved Drawings. Ginevers, Bawtry Road, Blyth.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for the variation of condition 2 on P/A 19/01020/LBA to allow changes to the approved drawings.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The variation is similar in scale and overall design but has been simplified. The Conservation Team are in support of this.

A neighbouring property has raised an objection citing the following concerns:

- Loss of sunlight and increased utility bills
- Loss of property valuation
- Loss of living conditions and impact on mental health
- Damage to the boundary wall
- Impact on residential amenity

The Parish Council have no objection subject to suitable parking arrangements being implemented.

Officer advised that any potential damage to the boundary wall would be a private matter and would be the developer's responsibility to avoid. The scale of the extension will not result in overshadowing and therefore will have limited impact on residential amenity.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
23/01533/HSE	Two Storey and Single Storey Rear Extension and Front Bow Window (Resubmission of 23/00509/HSE) 76 Williams Street, Langold.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for a two storey and single storey rear extension with a front bow window (resubmission of 23/00509/HSE).

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The original submission was refused in September 2023 on the following grounds:

- The proposed extension projected close to the common boundary by 12m.
- Impact upon the solar panels of a neighbouring property (east and west slope of the roof).

The re-submission has been reduced so that the extension only projects by 4m.

A sun study has shown there will be an impact upon the neighbouring property to the south but this will only result in approx. 3 hours loss of sunlight in December on the west elevation.

A neighbouring property has objected citing the following concerns:

- Overshadowing of their kitchen and conservatory
- Inconvenience during construction hours and impact upon their mental health
- Impact on solar panels

Officer satisfied the extension has been substantially reduced in scale and the impact upon residential amenity has been overcome by the sun study.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
23/00463/FUL	Sixteen Bay Golf Driving Range, Video Room, Ball Wash and Floodlights Land at Retford Golf Club, Brecks Road, Retford.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for a sixteen bay golf driving range, video room, ball wash and floodlights. The land is located south of the golf club and is currently used by them for practice and coaching activities.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Highways are comfortable with the proposal subject to conditions on visibility splays and parking arrangements being developed in accordance with the details submitted.

Rights of Way have no objections.

Environmental Health have raised a concern regarding lighting and have requested the submission of a lighting assessment. Officer advised a condition will be imposed regarding this.

Members were advised that there are residential properties located east of the site in question, behind the driving range, so there are no concerns as the balls will be hit in the opposite direction to the housing.

An objection has been received from the applicant of the Ordsall South application that is adjacent to this site. This is currently an open space of land that is used for recreational purposes. They are concerned that there has been a lack of assessment on ball strikes and the impact it may have on their playing fields.

Officer satisfied the applicant has submitted a plan for protective fencing to run along the rights of way north and south of the site so there will be a limited impact upon the surrounding area.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
23/01435/FUL	Alteration of Existing Premises to Create Additional Bedrooms within Footprint of the Existing Building, Including New Reception Area and to Carry-out Associated Minor Internal Alterations. South Moor Lodge Care Home, South Moor Road, Walkeringham.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for the alteration of existing premises to create additional bedrooms within footprint of the existing building, including a new reception area and carry out associated minor internal alterations.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

A neighbouring property to the east of the site has objected on the grounds of overshadowing and loss of privacy. An officer visited the property and is of the opinion that there will be no impact.

Highways initially objected to the application with concerns over the two access points serving the site.

The applicant has now removed one of the access points and implemented a two way traffic flow at the other and provided 32 car parking spaces.

Highways and the neighbouring property were re-consulted and raised no further objections.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
23/00624/VOC	Variation of Conditions 2 (landscaping) 3 (boundary treatment) and 10 (plans) on P.A 21/00811/VOC.

Land Fronting Breck Lane and Thorpe Road, Mattersey.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for the variation of conditions 2, 3 and 10.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The variation of conditions relate to a small development consisting of 5 dwellings that are largely complete.

The side boundary of plot 1 will now consist of a wall and hedge in front of it.

The Parish Council have objected as they feel that the variations are deviating from the original sympathetic development, it detracts from the character of the surrounding area and the hedge will impact visibility from plot 2 and 3.

A neighbouring occupier has objected on the grounds of the wall being out of character and concerns over the existing roadside hedge being removed. Officer advised Members no hedges will be removed only additional planting will take place.

Officer satisfied there will be no detrimental impact on residential amenity or highway safety.

Officer recommendation – Grant variation of conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
20/01026/FUL	Erect 4 Detatched Dwellings, 1 Detatched Bungalow and 4 Semi Detatched Dwellings with Garaging. Land to the East of Brickenhole Lane, Walkeringham.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to erect 4 detached dwellings, 1 detached bungalow and 4 semi-detached dwellings with garaging.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have no objection subject to conditions.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have no objection as the site is located within Flood Zone 1 presenting a low risk of flooding.

The Parish Council have expressed their support for the application subject to safe and suitable means of access to the site being implemented.

Two neighbouring properties have objected on the grounds of highway safety, additional traffic, loss of privacy, noise and flood risk.

Highways have requested that the applicant carries out substantial highway works to the site including the following:

- Widening the carriageway width by 5.5m.
- A 2m footpath to the frontage of the site.
- A 1.5m footway from Brickenhole Lane extending up to South Moor Road.

Officer advised that Brickenhole Lane currently consists of grass verges and no footway. A 30mph speed limit is in place but changes to 60mph approximately half way down the carriageway.

Officers are recommending a grant of planning permission contrary to Highway advice for the following reasons:

- The development is small in scale, consisting of only 9 dwellings. The proposed housing mix is supported by the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The lane is quiet and an additional 9 dwellings is not expected to lead to an increase in footfall that would excuse destroying the local character with tarmac.
- The developer is going to widen the carriageway by 5.5m which will still allow extra space for pedestrians to use the lane.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

71. Any other business which the Chairman considers to be urgent

As there was no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting.

(Meeting ended at 4:52pm).

Planning Consultation Group

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 2nd April 2024 via MS Teams

Present Councillors: S Fielding, and N Sanders.

Officers in attendance: A Broadhead, J Elliot, L Ip, J Krawczyk and L Thompson.

(Meeting opened at 4:00pm).

72. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M Charlesworth and F McFarland.

73. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest by Members.

74. Planning Applications

Ref. No.	Description
23/00758/COU	Conversion of Office and Salon (Class E) into One 11 Bed House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). Suite 1, 15 Churchgate, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 6PA.

Members were advised that the application sought to convert an office and salon into one 11 bed house in multiple occupation (HMO).

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The Conservation Officer is comfortable with the proposed alterations as any impact on the Grade 2 listed building will be mitigated by conditions.

Environmental Health have no objection but have raised a concern regarding the proximity of the HMO to the neighbouring public house. They have proposed that noise mitigation measures are included as a condition.

Two letters of objection have been received. The first from the local library on the grounds of concerns over the shared gated access, storage of materials and parking provision during construction hours. The second from a local resident with concerns over the level of amenity the occupiers of the HMO will have.

No objections were received from other statutory consultees.

Officer has no concerns over the shared gated access as the main point of entry for the HMO will be the front door. There is no onsite parking but plenty of parking availability in the area and with regards to any issues during construction hours, a Construction Environmental Management Plan will be required.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

23/01060/LBA	Listed Building Consent Conversion of Office and Salon (Class E) into One 11 Bed House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).
--------------	--

Suite 1, 15 Churchgate, Retford, Nottinghamshire DN22 6PA.

Members were advised that the application sought listed building consent for the conversion of an office and salon into one 11 bed house in multiple occupation (HMO).

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The Conservation Officer is comfortable with the proposed alterations as any impact upon the Grade 2 listed building will be mitigated by conditions.

Officer recommendation – Grant listed building consent.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

24/00096/HSE	Erect Single Storey Rear Extension and Single Storey Side Extension.
--------------	--

Lincoln Cottage, Town Street, Clayworth, Nottinghamshire DN22 9AD.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to erect a single storey rear extension and a single storey side extension at Lincoln Cottage.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The Conservation Officer is satisfied the character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved.

Clayworth Parish Council are in support of the application but have commented on the proposed use of UPVC windows and doors. Members were advised that the existing dwelling already has UPVC windows and doors in place so they would be acceptable.

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring property with concerns over access to the existing garage, parking arrangements, visual impact, shared ownership of the land and overshadowing.

No objections were received from statutory consultees.

Members were advised that whilst there will be no access to the garage it will be retained for storage. There is space for three cars at the property and as the extension will be no higher than the existing property, there will not be any unacceptable overshadowing. Existing boundary treatment will also prevent this.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
-----------------	--------------------

24/00163/HSE Two Storey and Single Storey Rear Extension.

16 Ings Lane, West Stockwith, South Yorkshire DN10 4HE.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for a two storey and single storey rear extension to an existing property.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

No objections have been received from statutory consultees or members of the public.

West Stockwith Parish Council have commented that it is not clear if the application passes the 45 degree test.

Members were advised that the single storey element does fail the test but Officers are not overly concerned as the extension will only be 4m in length.

Officer of the opinion that given the orientation of the extension in reference to neighbouring properties, the overall impact upon amenity will be limited.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No. Description

24/00080/HSE Erect Single Storey Side and Rear Extension With Car Port Extension.

5 Richmond Road, Carlton In Lindrick, Nottinghamshire S81 9DN.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to erect a single storey side and rear extension with a car port extension to an existing bungalow.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

One letter of objection has been received from a neighbouring property on the grounds of overshadowing their garden.

No objections have been received from statutory consultees or other members of the public.

Officer satisfied there would not be any unacceptable overshadowing given the scale of the proposal as the overall height of the extension is lower than the existing property by 1m.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No. Description

24/00021/FUL Erection of Three Detached Domestic Dwellings and Associated Works

Land North Blackbird Avenue Worksop

Members were advised of an application seeking permission to erect three detached domestic dwellings and associated works.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

The application was referred to Planning Consultation Group following a call-in request by a Ward Member.

4 letters of support have been received referencing an ongoing housing shortage in the district.

Environmental Health have no objection subject to a Contamination Stage 1 Risk Assessment.

The Highway Authority have objected on the grounds of low availability for onsite parking which would encourage parking close to the junction.

17 letters of objection were received from members of the public on the following grounds:

- Loss of open space
- Overshadowing
- Flooding and drainage concerns
- Biodiversity net loss
- Highway safety

Officer recommendation is to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:

- There is a strong housing land supply in the district so it would be unacceptable to erode the openness of the area for three new dwellings.
- The proposed garages are substandard and so it is likely future occupiers would not park their cars inside, this would encourage on street parking detriment to highway safety.
- No ecological appraisal provision or details of biodiversity net gain have been submitted by the applicant.
- The site lies in Flood Zone 1 but is at high risk of surface water flooding. The applicant has not provided evidence to show that the proposal would not increase surface water flood risk elsewhere.

Officer recommendation – Refuse planning permission.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
24/00033/FUL	Construction and Operation of Additional Plant for Electrolytic Green Hydrogen Production and Associated Works Land At High Marnham Power Station, Power Station Access, Fledborough Road, High Marnham.

Members were advised of an application seeking permission for the construction and operation of an additional plant for electrolytic green hydrogen production and associated works.

There are two existing permissions granted on the site dating back to October 2023 and February 2024, the proposed application is to increase the capacity and efficiency of the existing plant.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Three letters of objection have been received from local residents on the grounds of additional traffic and the impact on cyclists and pedestrians.

Normanton on Trent with Marnham Parish Council have objected on the grounds of the cumulative impact of traffic.

Rights of Way have presented a plan showing that there is an established footpath on the site. This appears to be a historic claim and is currently being investigated.

The Highway Authority have thoroughly assessed the proposal and have no concerns.

Environmental Health have commented that the Noise Impact Assessment has shown that the noise generated from this proposal will be no higher than the other applications granted permission on this site.

No objections have been received from other statutory consultees subject to conditions.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Ref. No.	Description
24/00102/FUL	Retrospective Application for Erection of Timber Framed Stables and Storage for Private Use Only. Stables at Stonelake, Chainbridge Lane, Lound.

Members were advised of a retrospective application seeking permission for the erection of timber framed stables and storage for private use only.

Plans were circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Lound Parish Council have objected on the grounds of highway safety and close proximity to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

No objections have been received from other statutory consultees or neighbouring properties.

Officer advised that there will be a condition imposed to restrict the use to domestic only at no detriment to highway safety. There is a good separation distance between the site and the SSSI. The closest point is approximately 300m north of the stables. The keeping of domestic horses is not thought to have any impact on the SSSI and will be no detriment to local wildlife.

Officer recommendation – Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Outcome following PCG – Refer for Officer Decision.

Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs)

The Planning Development Manager provided a brief update regarding the One Earth Solar Farm NSIP and advised that Bassetlaw District Council are looking at signing a Planning

Performance Agreement with the applicant. This will mean that Bassetlaw District Council will commit to undertaking work and providing responses within certain timeframes.

This was noted by Members.

75. Any other business which the Chairman considers to be urgent

As there was no other business, the Chairman closed the meeting.

(Meeting ended at 4:55pm).

Planning Committee

24th April 2024

Outstanding Minutes List

Members please note that the updated positions are shown in bold type following each item.

(PDM = Planning Development Manager)

Min. No.	Date	Subject	Decision	Officer Responsible
-----------------	-------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------------------

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE,24th April 2024**INFORMATION REPORT****APPEAL DECISION RECEIVED**

23/00752/FUL	Mr J Kennedy	Appeal against the refusal for change of use of land with the construction of hardstanding for the storage of caravans, Olive Tree Camping and Caravans, Main Street, Clarborough.
--------------	-----------------	--

An application for the Change of Use of Land with the Construction of Hardstanding for the Storage of Caravans under delegated authority on 8th August 2023 for the following reasons;

1. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 84 supports sustainable business growth. Bassetlaw Local Development Framework Policy DM1 similarly supports rural employment development where it requires the specific countryside location and that the scale, design and form of the development is appropriate for its location and setting and compatible with surrounding land uses.

Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan Policy 7 also supports employment development where development is principally for B1 or B2 use; and the scale, design and form is in keeping with its surroundings and does not have a detrimental impact on amenity of the area, environmental issues or highway safety.

The proposed development is not considered to be of an appropriate scale and form for its location and setting. Insufficient details have been submitted to demonstrate that this specific location is necessary for the storage of caravans and that there are no alternative sites available. The development would extend into the rural countryside location, contrary to the aims of Policy DM9 of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework and Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment which seeks to conserve the open rural character of this high quality landscape.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 130 which requires new development to add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and be sympathetic to local history and character, including landscape setting. The proposal would similarly be contrary to Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy DM4 that requires high quality design reflecting local distinctiveness, Policy DM1 and Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan Policy 7, requiring the scale and form of development to be in keeping. The proposed development is inappropriate for its surroundings resulting in a detrimental impact on the character and environment of the area.

2. Paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that schemes can be supported where they provide safe and suitable access for all. This requirement is also contained in policy DM4 of the Council's Core Strategy and Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan Policy 7. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF makes it clear that development

should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. The development would utilise the access / egress arrangements associated with the existing caravan park. Inadequate information has been submitted in terms of the scale and operation of the proposal and the applicant has not demonstrated that the development would have safe and suitable access / egress arrangements and that adequate visibility splays can be achieved from the site egress onto the A620, contrary to the above policies and guidance.

3. The content of paragraph 180 of the NPPF is applicable as it states that in dealing with planning applications, councils must consider the harm of a scheme on biodiversity, including if significant harm cannot be avoided adequately mitigated or compensated for permission should be refused; and development within or outside a SSSI which is likely to have an adverse impact on it should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of location outweigh its impact. NPPF paragraph 179 and Bassetlaw Local Development Framework Policy DM9 adds that development proposals will be expected to take opportunities to secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. No ecological assessment has been submitted and insufficient details have been submitted to ascertain whether the proposed development meets the requirements of the above policies and guidance. As such the development would be contrary to the above policies and guidance.

The Inspector Considered that the main issues were:

- i.) Whether the proposal represents a suitable location for the development, having regard to relevant policies on development in the open countryside and the effect on the character and appearance of the area;
- ii.) Whether the existing site access is adequate to accommodate traffic movements arising from the proposal;
- iii.) The effect of the proposal on ecology and biodiversity on the site.

In respect to the above matters the inspector concluded:

i.) For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the aforementioned requirements of Policies DM1, DM9 and 7, and the aims of the Framework. Therefore, notwithstanding the general support afforded to rural business growth within the development plan and Framework, the harm identified to the landscape character of the area means the proposal would not represent a suitable location for the development.

ii.) In the absence of sufficient detail as to the level of increase in traffic or that adequate visibility could be provided, the proposal fails to demonstrate that it would provide a safe access and so would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This conflicts with the requirements to provide safe access and not exacerbate highway safety problems under Policy DM4 of the CS, Policy 7 of the CWNP and the Framework.

iii.) I understand the concerns raised by interested parties that the loss of an existing, established hedgerow may have had a particular adverse effect on ecology were it to be used for foraging and nesting, and that this would take time to replace. However, the evidence before me from the appellant is ultimately not challenged by the Council. It sets out that the proposal would achieve greater than 10% biodiversity net gain both in area and hedgerow terms, which could be secured by condition. This would accord with the requirements of Policy DM9 of the CS and with the latest approach of the Framework and would represent a small benefit of the proposal.

DECISION: Appeal DISMISSED by the Inspector.

A copy of the Inspector's decision letter follow this report.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

FINALISED DECISION LEVEL: Delegated

This page is intentionally left blank



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2024

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/23/3330278

Olive Tree Camping and Caravans, Main Street, Clarborough DN22 9NJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Kennedy against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00752/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land with the construction of hardstanding for the storage of caravans.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was not made on a retrospective basis, but from the Council's delegated report and my site visit, it is clear that development has taken place, with hardstanding laid and caravans being stored on the land. I have therefore treated the proposal as partly retrospective in nature, as other elements are proposed which have not been implemented. For the avoidance of doubt, my assessment is based primarily on the submitted plans.
3. A new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023. The parts of the Framework most relevant to the appeal have not substantively changed from the previous iteration. Consequently, this does not fundamentally alter the main parties' cases, and it is not necessary to seek further comments. References hereafter in the decision to the Framework are to the December 2023 version.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal represents a suitable location for the development, having regard to relevant policies on development in the open countryside and the effect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Whether the existing site access is adequate to accommodate traffic movements arising from the proposal;
 - The effect of the proposal on ecology and biodiversity on the site.

Reasons

Development in the Countryside

5. Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD (December 2011) (the CS) supports economic development in rural areas

where it requires a specific countryside location and that the scale, design and form of the development is appropriate for its location and setting and compatible with surrounding land uses. Policy 7 of the Clarbrough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan (2017) (the CWNP) sets out similar criteria. Policy DM9 of the CS further requires developments to be sensitive to their landscape setting and to enhance the distinctive qualities of the landscape character policy zone in which they would be situated, as identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (BLCA).

6. These policies reflect the approach of the Framework, which supports the growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, including sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that respects the character of the countryside and adds to the overall quality of the area through high standards of design.
7. The appeal relates to an established caravan and camping park located within the open countryside to the south of Clarbrough. The site is a narrow, deep rectangular shape, with open agricultural fields to three sides and the A620 road to the fourth side. A hand car wash business within the appellant's ownership stands to the front of the site, with the tourism facilities to the rear.
8. The sides of the site are defined by mature hedgerows, as was the rear boundary prior to recent works which have removed a stretch of the hedgerow and created an access to the adjacent field. A rectangular area of hardstanding has been laid, on which were stored some 19 caravans at the time of my visit.
9. The removal of the hedgerow has resulted in the loss of a natural boundary which would have had an important function in screening the development from the wider countryside. Instead, the site has been opened up to clear views, most prominently from Bonemill Lane immediately to the south, from dwellings along the lane, from a public footpath running north from the lane a short distance to the west and from the towpath of the Chesterfield Canal slightly further west. In particular the very noticeable white exteriors of the caravans are clearly seen from these vantage points due to the open, flat topography and absence of other significant hedgerows filtering views.
10. The appellant's own evidence includes aerial photography from 2007, 2015 and 2020 showing the field to the rear as a ploughed field, consistent with the open, agricultural character of land to the north, south and west. Contrary to the appellant, I do not regard the hardstanding area as a 'natural extension of the site' as it has involved the destruction of the hedgerow and a crudely formed area of crushed stone spilling into the adjacent field. Whereas the site had been contained physically and visually by the hedgerows, it now extends incongruously into the open countryside with no effective screening. The adverse visual impact is exacerbated by the number of caravans stored on the site and their haphazard arrangement.
11. The appellant points to the landscape not being particularly sensitive. Whilst the landscape is not designated for specific qualities, the Framework states that decisions should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. The site lies within the Idle Lowlands Policy Zone 08: Retford of the BLCA, the recommendations of which are to conserve permanent pasture and the historic field pattern; maintain existing strong hedgerow structure and concentrate new development around the north-eastern fringe of Retford. The development contravenes each of these principles, eroding the intrinsic

character and beauty of the countryside to which the site in its previous condition contributed.

12. The appellant proposes a wildflower meadow immediately around the storage area within the red line and a wildlife pond to the west of within the remainder of the field, both as part of proposed biodiversity enhancements. However, in landscape terms, neither would provide effective screening that would adequately mitigate the visual harm caused by the caravan storage area. Moreover, a line of proposed trees is shown planted on land falling outside both the red and blue lines, and therefore does not appear to be within the appellant's control to provide. Even if planted on the appellant's land, this would still not screen the clear views from the south on Bonemill Lane.
13. The proposal would additionally result in a small loss of agricultural land which the evidence indicates was used for arable farming in recent years. Although the appellant's evidence on biodiversity ascribed the baseline position of the site as 'modified grassland' in poor condition, I have no evidence that the land has become unsuitable for growing crops, but it is clear that the subdivision of the wider field and the development already implemented and further proposed would permanently reduce the amount of agricultural land on the site.
14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the aforementioned requirements of Policies DM1, DM9 and 7, and the aims of the Framework. Therefore, notwithstanding the general support afforded to rural business growth within the development plan and Framework, the harm identified to the landscape character of the area means the proposal would not represent a suitable location for the development.

Access

15. The storage use of the land would be accessed via the existing in-out entrance from the A620 used by the caravan park and the car wash. The appellant's transport note sets out that sufficient visibility of 2.4m x 120m, based on the 40mph speed limit, would be achievable to the south but not to the north, where only 80m visibility exists. It adds that the local highway authority raised no concerns over visibility at the access when permission was granted in 2020 (Council Ref 20/00583/FUL) for an additional 12 static caravans at the site.
16. The Council's concerns relate primarily to a lack of detail as to the amount and frequency of traffic generated by the storage use. The transport note estimates negligible increases in traffic due to the storage use being a low trip generator, but this conclusion is reached despite acknowledging further information was to be provided by the appellant regarding the number of additional trips.
17. Storage use may mean many caravans would stay on site for significant periods of time without generating any associated traffic, whilst others may be moved on and off site more frequently, particularly during the holiday season. However, I do not have precise details of the total number of caravans to be stored, the expected number of trips or their frequency, and therefore I am unable to conclude that the proposal would have no more than a negligible impact on the operation of the highway as argued by the appellant.
18. Whilst I accept movements on and off site associated with the storage use are unlikely to be continuous or concentrated, the proposal would add traffic

beyond the existing levels of the tourism use and would increase occurrences of vehicles towing caravans entering and leaving the highway slowly. Coupled with the shortcomings of the northbound visibility splay, this has the potential to increase the risk of conflict with other road users. Whilst the appellant points to potential measures to improve visibility, the evidence is unclear that the land along the road verge is under the control of the local highway authority, such that I can have sufficient confidence that vegetation could be maintained to ensure visibility.

19. Therefore, in the absence of sufficient detail as to the level of increase in traffic or that adequate visibility could be provided, the proposal fails to demonstrate that it would provide a safe access and so would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This conflicts with the requirements to provide safe access and not exacerbate highway safety problems under Policy DM4 of the CS, Policy 7 of the CWNP and the Framework.

Biodiversity

20. The appellant has provided a Biodiversity Assessment at appeal stage. It sets out that the baseline condition of the site, prior to works being undertaken, was modified grassland in a 'poor' condition, whilst the former hedgerow was assessed to be in a 'good' condition. Based on the assessed value of biodiversity lost through the works already undertaken and the works proposed both within the red line of the site and the adjacent land to the west in the appellant's control, it is estimated that there would be biodiversity net gain in area units of 32.41% and in hedgerow units of 18.72%.
21. As pointed out, the plans before me indicate tree/hedgerow planting on land outside of the appellant's control. This may be a drafting error, but it appears possible to plant inside the boundary of the appellant's land and is a matter that could be addressed by condition through a detailed landscaping plan.
22. I note the Council's concern that the removed hedgerow was to be retained and reinforced with new planting under a condition of the planning permission in 2020 to site 12 additional caravans on the land. However, any concerns with respect to the enforcement of a planning condition are matters for the local planning authority in the first instance.
23. This aside, I understand the concerns raised by interested parties that the loss of an existing, established hedgerow may have had a particular adverse effect on ecology were it to be used for foraging and nesting, and that this would take time to replace. However, the evidence before me from the appellant is ultimately not challenged by the Council. It sets out that the proposal would achieve greater than 10% biodiversity net gain both in area and hedgerow terms, which could be secured by condition. This would accord with the requirements of Policy DM9 of the CS and with the latest approach of the Framework and would represent a small benefit of the proposal.

Other Matters

24. The appellant sets out that storage facilities often accompany popular caravan sites, that they are in high demand and that they present an opportunity for expansion and diversification. It is added that the extension of the existing site is preference to establishing a new site. I accept that the storage facility would provide an economic benefit for the appellant but I have no evidence as to the

extent of any benefit. However, the small scale of the proposal indicates that any benefits in terms of increased turnover would be minor in scale.

25. Moreover, the contention that storage facilities are commonplace at tourist sites is countered by comments from interested parties that storage facilities only exist at some 3% of Caravan and Motorhome Club sites. Ultimately, there is no substantive evidence that storage facilities need to be attached to tourism facilities for any operational reasons. Nor does the evidence suggest a demonstrable need for caravan storage facilities generally, or that there are no more suitable sites located within a built-up area, such that development in the open countryside could be avoided. As such, the arguments in favour of the facility as meeting a need attract no more than limited weight.
26. I have found the biodiversity issue to be acceptable on the evidence before me and afford some positive weight to biodiversity net gain. However, based on the comments made in representations, it appears that the Biodiversity Assessment may not have been available to interested parties on the Council's website. However, I have not pursued whether or not this was the case as my conclusions on the other main issues point to the dismissal of the appeal and were any additional public comments determinative in an alternative finding of a neutral or harmful impact on biodiversity, this would only serve to tip the planning balance further against the proposal. Therefore, I am satisfied that interested parties opposing the appeal have not been prejudiced.

Conclusion

27. For the reasons set out, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. I afford significant weight to this conflict. Material considerations advanced in this case, including the economic benefits and predicted biodiversity net gain attract only limited weight in favour and would not be sufficient to outweigh the development plan conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K. Savage

INSPECTOR

This page is intentionally left blank

ITEM SUBJECT OF A SITE VISIT

Item No: A1

Application Ref.	23/00696/COU
Application Type	Change of Use
Site Address	Strawberry Fields Land Off A631 Beckingham South Yorkshire
Proposal	Change of Use of Land to Residential Caravan Compliant Site for Gypsy/Traveller Use with Pony Paddock
Case Officer	Kirsty Harte
Recommendation	GTD - Grant
Web Link:	Link to Public Access Documents

THE APPLICATION**SITE CONTEXT**

The site is located to the west of the village of Beckingham which lies to the opposite side of the A631. The site lies directly adjacent to the A631 and is well screened by existing hedgerows and mature trees.

Access to the site is taken from an existing, well established point which is set back off the A631. There is a second access, which is more historic than the main access.

The site has an historic use as a strawberry farm, with the area of grassland to the rear of the site being used from the growing of crops with hardstanding to the front of the site accommodating agricultural buildings and touring caravans.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the change of use of land to residential caravan site for gypsy/traveller use with pony paddock.

The residential use proposed would comprise 2 static caravans and 2 touring caravans that would be positioned centrally within the site, to the rear of the existing agricultural building. The proposed paddock would be positioned within the field to the rear (west) of the site.

It is proposed to access the site by utilising the 2 existing points of access directly on to the A631. It is proposed that the accesses would provide an access and egress point. Access to the site is set back from the A631 due to the wide highway verge and footway.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provision of the development plan, as far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

Other material planning considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the National Planning Policy Guidance.

National Planning Policy Framework 2023

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's approach for the planning system and how these are expected to be applied.

Paragraph 8 explains that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform an economic, social and environmental role.

Paragraph 11 explains that at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay; and where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission shall be granted unless:

- i. The application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The following sections of the framework are applicable to this development:

Part 4 – Decision Making

Part 5 – Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes

Part 12 – Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places

Part 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Bassetlaw District Council – Local Development Framework

**Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Development Plan Document
(Adopted December 2011):**

- Policy CS1 - Settlement hierarchy
- Policy CS9 - All Other Settlements
- Policy DM4 - Design & character

- Policy DM6 - Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People
- Policy DM9 - Delivering open space and sports facilities
- Policy DM12 - Flood risk, sewage and drainage

Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038

The Council published the Inspector's Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 on the 21 February 2024. This means that the Local Plan carries significant weight in decision-making. The Local Plan is expected to be considered by Full Council later in 2024.

- Policy ST1 – Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy
- Policy ST32 - Sites for Gypsies, Travellers
- Policy ST35 - Design Quality
- Policy ST37 - Landscape Character
- Policy ST40 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- Policy 48 - Protecting Amenity
- Policy ST52 - Flood Risk and Drainage

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

RESPONSE OF STATUTORY BODIES

Nottinghamshire County Council Highways

No objections subject to conditions to secure satisfactory access arrangements.

Beckingham Parish Council

Object to the proposal on the following grounds;

- Design and visual impact on the area
- Parking/highway safety
- Traffic access
- Health and safety
- Noise, smell, pollution
- Layout and density of buildings
- Design, appearance and materials
- Rise in crime
- Ecology and environment impact
- Cumulative impact
- Flooding
- Housing demand quota exceeded

Bassetlaw District Council Environmental Health

No objections.

Councillor Sanger

Object to the proposal on the following grounds;

- There has never been a planning application on the site so how is this a change of use?
- The site hasn't previously contained buildings
- Concerns regarding highway safety as the A631 is a busy dual carriageway which is used by fast moving traffic
- The site is positioned outside the village envelope
- The site is not connected to mains electricity, water or sewerage
- There has been enough development in Beckingham and the site is not suitable for habitation

Members of the Public

203 letters of objection have been received from members of the public. The following issues were raised;

- Harmful to the Green Belt
- Highway safety
- Excess waste
- Overrun schools, services and facilities
- Increased noise
- Residential amenity
- Impact on housing prices
- Housing quota exceeded
- Correct connection to electricity and water is uncertain

The material planning considerations within these objections will be addressed within the main body of this report.

CONSIDERATION OF PLANNING ISSUES

PRINCIPLE

National Planning Policy Context

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) (March 2015) para. 25 states that local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.

In terms of decision-making, PPTS Policy H requires applications to be considered in accordance with the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development and sets out other relevant matters when considering planning applications for traveller sites:

- i). the existing level of local provision and need for sites;
- ii). the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants;
- iii). other personal circumstances of the applicant;
- iv). that the locally specific criteria used to guide the allocation of sites in plans or which form the policy where there is no identified need for plans or which form the policy where there is no identified need for pitches/plots should be used to assess applications that may come forward on unallocated sites; and
- vi). that they should determine application for sites from any travellers and not just those with local connections.

The PPTS goes on to state that when considering applications, local planning authorities should attach weight to the following matters:

- a) effective use of previously developed (brownfield), untidy or derelict land
- b) sites being well planned or soft landscaped in such a way as to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness
- c) promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles, such as ensuring adequate landscaping and play areas for children
- d) not enclosing a site with so much hard landscaping, high walls or fences, that the impression may be given that the site and its occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community

With regard to plan-making, the PPTS is aligned with the NPPF recommends that local planning authorities should set pitch provisions for gypsies and travellers. Furthermore, local plans should identify and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of sites, and a supply of developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years six to ten and where possible, for years 11-15.

Local Planning Policy Context

Core Strategy Policy CS1 sets out the settlement hierarchy for Bassetlaw and establishes the locations for future housing and employment growth. As noted above, the nearest settlements of Beckingham (Policy CS9) is regarded as unsustainable locations for growth.

Bassetlaw's own policy for determining such applications is Policy DM6: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. In the event that pitch requirements cannot be met within or on the edge of settlements with ready access to services and facilities, rural and semi-rural locations may be appropriate where there is reasonable access to services and facilities. All sites will need to demonstrate that:

- i. the scale and design of the site is appropriate to its surrounding location and makes efficient use of land;
- ii. there is adequate space for parking, turning, servicing and waste collection/recycling on site;

- iii. appropriate landscaping and boundary treatments will be provided to give privacy and to enhance the local environment;
- iv. there is safe vehicular access to the public highway; v. the site will be properly serviced by utilities such as water and sewerage; and
- vi. the site is not located in an area at high risk of flooding and is not significantly contaminated.

Furthermore, applications for new sites must demonstrate that:

- the intended occupants meet the definition of gypsies and travellers or the definition of travelling showpeople; and
- there is a need for additional pitches in the area proposed and there are no alternative sites available in the District.

The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan

The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan now carries significant weight in decision-making and contains policy ST32: Sites for Gypsies and Travellers. Paragraph 173 of Inspectors Report on the Examination of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states the Plan allocates sufficient pitches to meet the need for the 10–year period 2019/20 to 2028/29.

The policy states:

1. The permanent accommodation needs of the District’s Gypsy and Traveller community will be met through the provision for 49 permanent pitches by 2037-2038, with approximately 27 permanent pitches to be delivered by 2028-2029, through a combination of:

a) The establishment or re-establishment of pitches within an existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller site and/or the extension and/or intensification of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites at:

- i. GT001: Land at Hayton (for 10 additional pitches);
- ii. GT002: Land at Treswell (for 10 additional pitches);
- iii. GT003: Land at Daneshill (for 6 additional pitches)

b) the formalisation of sites in use by the Gypsy and Traveller community at:

- i. GT004: Land at East Drayton (for 1 additional pitch)
- ii. GT005: Land at North Blyth (for 4 additional pitches)

2. Proposals for new Gypsy and Traveller sites and/or the extension, and/or intensification of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites to address needs beyond 2028-2029 should:

- a) be located outside high flood risk areas as defined by national policy;
- b) in the case of an extension, be small scale, intensify the use of an existing authorised, well managed site and/or make effective use of brownfield land, where possible;

- c) provide satisfactory access to a range of services such as health and education provision;
- d) be of a scale that is appropriate to local character, its local services and infrastructure and would not dominate the nearest settled community;
- e) have suitable, safe and convenient access to the highway network;
- f) have the ability to connect to all necessary utilities on the site including mains water, electricity supply, drainage, sanitation and provision for the screened storage and collection of refuse, including recyclable materials;
- g) have the ability to be well integrated into the local townscape or landscape, have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity and/or heritage assets and use boundary treatments and screening materials which are sympathetic to the existing urban or rural form;
- h) ensure the amenity of the Gypsy and Traveller community and the settled community is managed appropriately in accordance with Policy 48; and
- i) ensure that there is sufficient space for the planned number of pitches, outdoor space, day rooms, parking and the safe movement of personal and commercial vehicles.

Policy ST32 is considered to be the most up-to-date policy by which to consider this application against. Whilst it has been confirmed that Bassetlaw Local Plan allocates sufficient pitches to meet the need for the 10–year period 2019/20 to 2028/29, Policy ST32 does allow for additional sites to be granted permission. Therefore, subject to compliance with the criteria set out in the Policy, it is considered that the proposed use is acceptable in principle.

Compliance with Policy ST32

An assessment of the compliance of the proposal with the criteria set out within Policy ST32 is set out below;

- a) be located outside high flood risk areas as defined by national policy;

The site lies within Flood Zone 1, land at the lowest risk of flooding. This will also be assessed within the flood Risk section of this report.

- b) in the case of an extension, be small scale, intensify the use of an existing authorised, well managed site and/or make effective use of brownfield land, where possible;

Given this proposal is not for an extension to an existing site it is not considered that this criteria is applicable in the consideration of this application.

- c) provide satisfactory access to a range of services such as health and education provision;

Beckingham is identified as a Rural Service Centre by Policy CS8 of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework and a Small Rural Settlement by Policy ST1 of the Draft Local Plan which states the evidence finds that the sustainable growth of the Small Rural Settlements would also help to sustain these villages. Beckingham does have a school and village shop / Post Office meaning future occupants would benefit from access to a limited range of services.

- d) be of a scale that is appropriate to local character, its local services and infrastructure and would not dominate the nearest settled community;

Compliance with this criteria will be assessed within the Impact on Character and Appearance section of the report.

e) have suitable, safe and convenient access to the highway network;

Compliance with this criteria will be assessed within the Highways Impact section of the report.

f) have the ability to connect to all necessary utilities on the site including mains water, electricity supply, drainage, sanitation and provision for the screened storage and collection of refuse, including recyclable materials;

The applicant has stated that foul water will be disposed of by the mains drainage system and the existing agricultural building includes a kitchen with electricity and water, therefore the necessary utilities are already available at the site. Whilst no details have been provided in respect of waste storage and collection, it is considered that these can be secured through the imposition of a suitably worded condition.

g) have the ability to be well integrated into the local townscape or landscape, have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity and/or heritage assets and use boundary treatments and screening materials which are sympathetic to the existing urban or rural form;

This criteria will be assessed within the Impact on Character and Appearance section of this report.

h) ensure the amenity of the Gypsy and Traveller community and the settled community is managed appropriately in accordance with Policy 48; and

The impact upon residential amenity of both the existing nearby occupiers to the site and the future occupiers of the site will be assessed within the Residential Amenity Section of this report.

i) ensure that there is sufficient space for the planned number of pitches, outdoor space, day rooms, parking and the safe movement of personal and commercial vehicles.

This criteria will be assessed with the Residential Amenity section of this report.

SUSTAINABILITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF sets out three dimensions for sustainable development, economic, social and environmental:

“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;

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 a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

In reaching a decision on this case, the NPPF at paragraph 9 makes it clear that the objectives referred to above should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions and are not criteria against which every planning application should be judged against.

IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE

The Bassetlaw Local Development Framework contains policy DM4 which states that new development should respect its wider surroundings in relation to historic development patterns and forms and landscape character. Similar advice is contained in paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

Policy ST32 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states Proposals for new Gypsy and Traveller sites and/or the extension, and/or intensification of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites to address needs beyond 2028-2029 should have the ability to be well integrated into the local townscape or landscape, have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity and/or heritage assets and use boundary treatments and screening materials which are sympathetic to the existing urban or rural form.

Policy ST35 states that all development must be of a high quality design and Policy ST37 states proposals that contribute to the nature and quality of Bassetlaw's landscapes will be supported where it can be demonstrated that: a) it protects and where possible enhances the distinctive qualities of the relevant landscape character policy zone, as identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment 2009 by conserving, restoring, reinforcing or creating relevant landscape forms and features

In addition policy DM9 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that new development proposals in and adjoining the countryside will be expected to be designed so as to be sensitive to their landscape setting.

The site lies within Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Landscape Policy Zone 03: Beckingham where the landscape condition is very good. There is a coherent pattern of elements with few detracting features including the A161/A620/A631 and several oil wells. Overall this results in a visually unified area.

In terms of landscape actions it is recommended that development;

- Conserves historic field pattern by containing new development within historic enclosed boundaries, maintain existing hedgerows, restore and reinforce poor hedgerow boundaries where necessary
- Conserves hedgerow planting along roadsides, seek to reinforce and enhance as appropriate
- Conserve the open rural character of the landscape by concentrating new development of appropriate design and scale around the existing settlements of Beckingham, Saundby and North Wheatley.

The application site currently forms part of an agricultural field which has mature hedgerows located on all boundaries. Therefore, the site in question is largely hidden by mature hedgerows on the boundaries of the site, it is considered that the creation of pitches and caravans would not therefore appear unduly obtrusive or prominent in the landscape. The site lies directly to the west of the built form of Beckingham and given the site is well screened by existing hedgerows and mature trees it is considered that the proposed development would comply with the recommendations of the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment.

Furthermore, the siting of 2 static caravans and touring caravans is considered to have a very limited visual impact due to their scale and the site does already accommodate an agricultural building and 2 touring caravans with the applicant stating 'The site has been purchased by the applicant due to it having an historical agricultural use along with the locating of at least 2 caravans by the previous owner for over 10 years. One of these units is still occupied regularly by a third party who continues to occupy with the permission of the current owner.'

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not represent a visually obtrusive form of development that would result in any demonstrable harm to the character of the surrounding area or the wider landscape character, particularly when compared to the existing development on the site and its historic use.

It is recommended however, that should permission be granted, a condition should be imposed requiring the retention of these boundary hedges.

Accordingly it is considered that the development as proposed would comply with the provisions of the policies outlined above.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Policy DM4 of the Core Strategy requires that development does not materially or detrimentally affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. This is also reflected in paragraph 135 criterion f) of the NPPF which states that development should create a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Paragraph 191 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. This includes and assessment of noise and light impact.

Policy ST32 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states Proposals for new Gypsy and Traveller sites and/or the extension, and/or intensification of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites to address needs beyond 2028-2029 should ensure the amenity of the Gypsy and Traveller community and the settled community is managed appropriately in accordance with Policy 48.

Policy 48 (Protecting Amenity) of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states that proposals for development should be designed and constructed to avoid and minimise impacts on the amenity of existing and future users, individually and cumulative within the development and close to it. Proposals will be expected to:

- a) Not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of existing and new residents and future occupiers of the proposed development through loss privacy, excessive overshadowing or overbearing impact.

As previously described, the proposed static and touring caravans would be of a modest scale and would be well screened by the existing hedgerows and trees. As the nearest dwellings to the proposed site are located over 40m to the opposite side of the A631 dual carriageway from the application site, it is considered that the siting of caravans on the site would have no adverse impact on the residential amenity of these dwellings by reason of overlooking, overshadowing or consequential loss of privacy.

Whilst it is accepted that the development would result in a small increase in vehicular movements to and from the site, it is not considered that that it would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance for existing residents, particularly given the modest amount of vehicular movement that would be generated by the proposal and the separation of existing residents from the site by the A631.

The submitted Proposed Site Plan shows 2 static caravans positioned within a generous plot with the paddock area positioned to the west. The development proposed is considered to offer a generous amount of amenity space to be enjoyed by future occupiers.

Accordingly it is considered that if permitted the development would comply with the provisions of the policies and guidance outlined above.

HIGHWAYS IMPACT

Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that schemes can be supported where they provide safe and suitable access for all. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF makes it clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Paragraph 96 of the NPPF states that all development should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which encourage social interaction, are safe and accessible and enable and support healthy lifestyles. Paragraph 114 of the NPPF requires schemes to provide safe and suitable access for all users as well as looking at appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes.

Paragraph 116b of the NPPF requires schemes to address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport.

Policy ST32 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states Proposals for new Gypsy and Traveller sites and/or the extension, and/or intensification of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites to address needs beyond 2028-2029 should have suitable, safe and convenient access to the highway network

This requirement is also contained in policy DM4 of the Council's Core Strategy and similar advice is also contained within the emerging local plan policies Policy ST35 (Design Quality) and Policy ST55 (Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active travel)

Policy ST35 (Design Quality) of the emerging local plan states that all development must be of a high-quality design and integrate well into the surrounding area, ensuring safe convenient movement of all highway users, Policy ST55 (Promoting Sustainable Transport and Active travel) of the emerging local plan states that development that contributes towards a sustainable, safe, active transport network and offers a range of public transport and active travel choices will be supported.

The submitted application states that the site has a historical agricultural use along with the siting of at least 2 caravans by the previous owner for over 10 years with one of those units being regularly occupied.

Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highway Authority have confirmed that it is content that the development would occupy land that has had a previous use and that access to the land from the A631 is still visible albeit unmaintained.

On 'A' and 'B' roads, when considering new development or development that would increase traffic and/or require new junctions, the County Council's policy is to require proposals to show an overall net benefit over an existing situation. On high-speed rural roads, there is a propensity for high severity accidents. It is considered that this application presents an opportunity to secure improved access arrangements and to control the quantum of development. On balance, it is considered that this would be an improvement over the existing situation which is much more uncertain.

The site currently has the benefit of one formal access from the A631 adjacent the south-eastern boundary. The initial surface is in a poor state of repair from the edge of the carriageway to a point where it disappears into highway verge. There are a set of gates adjacent the north-western boundary. However, the kerbs at that location are not dropped to facilitate access at that point, so it appears that no access required from that point when the bypass was constructed.

The Proposed Site Plan includes separate in and out access arrangements roughly in the position of the formal access and gates respectively. The Highway Authority have recommended that the exit should be angled to mirror the entrance to direct motorists to turn left to reduce the possibility of drivers exiting the site and turning right into oncoming traffic on the dual carriageway. Furthermore, the radius on the south-eastern side of the exit must be removed to make the right turn as difficult as possible.

Vehicles will egress that site and turn left on to the A631 in a northerly direction. Due to the straight alignment of the carriageway and the wide highway verge, visibility for vehicles egressing the site is considered to be acceptable.

Nottinghamshire County Council Highways have not raised any objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions; limiting the number of caravans on the site, requiring further details to ensure the site access is developed and retained in a suitable form, to prevent mud and debris being deposited on the highway during the construction phase, limiting the use of the paddock to being ancillary to the residential use of the site and to ensure gates are hung so as not to open outwards.

It is therefore considered that, subject to the imposition of conditions as requested by the Highway Authority, the development would benefit from a safe and suitable access and would not be detrimental to highway safety. It is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with the above-mentioned policies in terms of highways considerations.

FLOODING/DRAINAGE

The NPPF at paragraph 165 makes it clear that development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from the areas at the highest risk. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF requires that proposals do not increase flood risk elsewhere and should be developed in line with a site specific flood risk assessment which incorporates a Sustainable Urban Drainage solution. Similar advice is contained within Policy ST52 (Flood Risk and Drainage) of the emerging local plan.

The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which has the lowest probability of flooding from rivers and the sea. It is considered that the appropriate means of foul and surface water disposal can be secured by condition should planning permission be granted. This would ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and that foul water would be appropriately disposed of.

Therefore subject to an appropriately worded condition, it is considered that the development would comply with the provisions of the policies outlined above.

ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS

The content of paragraph 186 of the NPPF is applicable as it states that in dealing with planning applications, councils must consider the harm of a scheme on biodiversity. It states that the following principles should be applied (in summary):

- a) If significant harm cannot be avoided adequately mitigated or compensated for permission should be refused.
- b) Development within or outside a SSSI which is likely to have an adverse impact on it should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of location outweigh its impact
- c) Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused, unless there are exceptional reasons or compensation.
- d) Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported. Opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments

should be integrated as part of their design especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

Policy DM9 of the Core Strategy is consistent with the above and adds that development proposals will be expected to take opportunities to restore or enhance habitats and species' populations and to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect or result in the loss of features of recognised importance.

Policy ST32 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan states Proposals for new Gypsy and Traveller sites and/or the extension, and/or intensification of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites to address needs beyond 2028-2029 should have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity. Policy ST40 aims to protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of Bassetlaw.

The Environment Act 2021 is set to introduce requirements to achieve a 10% gain to biodiversity in planning decisions which has become a legal requirement for non-major developments from 2 April 2024. However, as this application was submitted prior to this date the development is exempt from this requirement. As such, the current position is that there should be no net loss in biodiversity.

The site already features some development and the applicant has stated that there has been regular occupation of a domestic caravan on the site. The caravans proposed would be sited on the existing hard-surfaced area to the front of the site, no further hard surfacing is proposed by this application. The rear of the site is currently grassed and shall remain as such for use as a paddock and amenity area for the use of future residents. The existing hedgerows are to be retained and it is considered that the imposition of a condition requiring the submission of a scheme of ecological enhancement within the site would ensure compliance with the policies detailed above.

CONCLUSION

The published Inspector's Report on the Examination of the Bassetlaw Local Plan states the Plan allocates sufficient pitches to meet the need for sites for gypsies and travellers for the 10-year period 2019/20 to 2028/29.

The Council published the Inspector's Report for the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 on the 21 February 2024, resulting in the Draft Local Plan carrying significant weight in decision-making. Policy ST32: Sites for Gypsies and Travellers is considered to be the most up-to-date policy by which to consider the principle of this proposal against. Whilst it has been confirmed that Bassetlaw Local Plan allocates sufficient pitches to meet the need for identified 10 year period, Policy ST32 does allow for additional sites to be granted permission, subject to compliance with the criteria set out in the Policy.

It is considered that the site would be a sustainable location for the type and scale of the development proposed and the proposal would have an acceptable impact in terms of landscape character, highway safety, residential amenity, flood risk and ecology.

For the reasons outlined above, it is therefore considered that the proposed development would comply with the guidance contained within Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015, the provisions of policies DM4, DM6, DM9 and DM12 of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework, Policies ST32, ST35, ST37, ST40, 48 and ST52 of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and parts 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted subject to the conditions detailed below.

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant subject to conditions

CONDITIONS/REASONS:

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Existing Site Plan, Drawing No. DNST 001, received 2nd June 2023
- Proposed Site Plan, Drawing No. DNST 003, received 2nd June 2023
- Design and Access Statement by Mark Simmonds Planning Services, received 2nd June 2023

Reason: For the avoidance of any doubt.

3. No more than 4 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended (of which no more than 2 shall be static caravans) shall be stationed on the application site at any one time.

Reason: To ensure no more than the number of units originally intended on the site are permitted, in the interests of highway safety.

4. The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

Reason: To ensure the development takes the form envisaged by the Local Planning Authority to meet the needs of the gypsy and travelling community.

4. Prior to the first occupation of the site full details of the manner in which foul sewage and surface water are to be disposed of from the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the occupation of the site first commences.

Reason: To ensure that the site is drained in a satisfactory manner.

5. Prior to the first occupation of the site a scheme of ecological enhancement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of ecology and biodiversity.

6. Prior to the site being first brought into use the access and egress arrangements shall be surfaced in a bound material (not loose gravel) for a minimum distance of 6.0m into the site from the highway boundary and which shall be drained to prevent the unregulated discharge of surface water onto the public highway.

Reason: To ensure appropriate access and parking arrangements are available, to reduce the possibility of deleterious material being deposited on the public highway (loose stones etc), to minimise the chance of highway flooding and severe icing, and in the interest of highway safety.

7. No development shall take place until such time as details of the proposed site access arrangements have been submitted to and have been approved by the Local Planning Authority that include the construction specification, measures to deter exiting right turning vehicles, left turn only signage, provision for the continued use of the footway crossed by the access arrangements, the closure and removal of redundant vehicular verge and footway crossing arrangements and verge and footway reinstatement, and the closure of the gap in the central reservation nearest to the site, and which shall be in place prior to the first delivery of a static caravan or the first occupation of a touring caravan on site.

Reason: To minimise the likelihood of motorists turning right out of the site into the opposing stream of traffic, to prevent u-turning on the dual carriageway, and in the general interest of highway safety.

8. All vehicles preparing to leave the site during the construction period shall have their wheels thoroughly washed should they be displaying signs of mud or debris and a mechanically propelled road sweeper shall be employed should mud or debris be transported onto the public highway immediately following each occurrence until such time as all mud and debris has been removed.

Reason: To minimise the exportation of mud and debris onto the public highway and to ensure that this is appropriately dealt with in the interest of highway safety

9. The pony paddock and any buildings to remain on site shall be used solely for equine and/or domestic purposes ancillary to the static and touring caravan pitches hereby approved and at no point shall be used as residential accommodation or for commercial purposes.

Reason: To ensure the proposed access arrangements are appropriate for the intended use in the interest of highway safety.

10. Any gates shall be hung so not to open outwards if otherwise capable of extending beyond the site boundary towards the carriageway.

Reason: To ensure a car towing a caravan can clear the public highway without obstruction in the interest of the free flow of traffic and in the interest of highway safety.

This page is intentionally left blank