

23/01926/FUL

Applicant Miss Rebecca Draper

Location Fosse Paddock Nottingham Road Cropwell Bishop Nottinghamshire
NG12 2JU

Proposal Single storey extension to existing holiday accommodation to create single, accessible holiday let

Ward Cropwell

Full details of the proposal can be found [here](#)

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site comprises a detached bungalow in a countryside location within a large plot. There is a separate detached building to the side/front used as holiday lets, with a hard surfaced driveway/parking area to the front of the buildings. The site is bounded by established hedgerows to the north and west, with post and rail fences to the south and east.
2. The site is located in the designated Green Belt, in a rural location around 1 mile to the west of the built-up part of Cropwell Bishop, and close to the junction of the A46 with Nottingham Road. There is a petrol filling/service station adjacent to the west, and large modern agricultural buildings with an agricultural worker's dwelling, and an anaerobic digestion plant on the opposite side (north) of Nottingham Road, and a separate poultry farm beyond.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

3. Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey extension to the north side of the existing holiday let building to create an accessible holiday let, with accommodation comprising a living/dining room/kitchen and en-suite bedroom. The external materials would be bricks & timber cladding, and concrete roof tiles to match the existing. Solar panels would be incorporated into the south facing roof slopes.
4. The Planning, Design and Access Statement states that the proposed accommodation would be able to cater for disabled occupiers and their carers by creating a safe, accessible and inclusive environment. The applicant has paddocks where Shetland ponies graze that are available for disabled children/adults to brush, feed and care for. There is various evidence amongst professional papers which support the provision of tourist accommodation for disabled individuals, which allows for and enables social contact and interaction with animals and others, helping to address issues of loneliness and isolation that can occur, and improve health and well-being.
5. The applicant considers that tourism/leisure, rural growth/diversification and economic benefits, and the provision of overnight accommodation for

disabled people and their carers would represent very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development and outweigh harm to the Green Belt.

SITE HISTORY

6. Permission was granted in 2016 for the change of use of a day nursery to 4 residential units for use as holiday lets and external alterations including an extension (ref. 16/01275/FUL).
7. Permission was refused in 2016 for the erection of a 4-bay oak framed domestic garage with ancillary accommodation above (ref. 16/01276/FUL).

REPRESENTATIONS

Copies of all representations can be found [here](#); however, summaries of all comments received are set out below.

Ward Councillor(s)

8. The Ward Councillor - Cllr Birch does not object.
9. Adjacent Ward Councillor Chewings does not object.
10. Adjacent Ward Councillor Ellis does not object.

Town/Parish Council

11. Cropwell Bishop Parish Council - No response has been received.
12. Cotgrave Town Council (adjacent Parish) do not object.

Statutory and Other Consultees

13. Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority refer to their Standing Advice.

Local Residents and the General Public

14. No written representations have been received.

PLANNING POLICY

15. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2014) (LPP1) and the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (2019) (LPP2). Other material considerations include Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

16. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. There are three

dimensions to sustainable development, economic, social, and environmental.

17. The following sections of the NPPF are relevant to this application.

- Chapter 2 – ‘Achieving Sustainable Development’
- Section 12 - ‘Achieving well designed and beautiful places’
- Section 13 - ‘Protecting Green Belt land’

Full details of the NPPF can be found [here](#).

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

18. The following policies in LPP1 are relevant.

- Policy 1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy 4 - Nottingham-Derby Green Belt
- Policy 10 - Design and Enhancing Local Identity
- Policy 13 - Culture Tourism and Sport

19. The following policies in LPP2 are relevant.

- Policy 1 - Development Requirements
- Policy 21 - Green Belt
- Policy 31 - Sustainable Tourism and Leisure

20. The full text of the policies in the LPP1 and LPP2, together with the supporting text, and the Residential Design Guide can be found in the Local Plan documents on the Council’s website at: [Planning Policy - Rushcliffe Borough Council](#)

APPRAISAL

21. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

22. The main issues in the consideration of the application are; the principle of development; Green Belt, design/impact upon the character and appearance of the streetscene, and impacts upon residential amenity.

Principle of Development

23. The building proposed to be extended represents an existing provision of 4 holiday lets on a site associated with an established residential dwelling known as Fosse Paddock. Policy 13 of the LPP1 and 31 of the LPP2 seek to support the retention and expansion of existing tourist accommodation where it accords with the principles of sustainable development and is not detrimental to the surrounding area. Part 2 of policy 31 of the LPP2 identifies

that there may be instances where facilities require a countryside location, but that within the countryside there is a preference for tourism related development to re-use land and buildings.

24. Whilst the site lies in an inherently unsustainable location outside of any defined settlement boundary, as the site represents an existing and established overnight accommodation provision as holiday lets, it is considered that on balance the principle of enhancing and increasing the provision be supported by policy.

Green Belt

25. Section 13 of the NPPF states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
26. Green Belt serves five purposes:
 - a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
 - e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
27. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
28. It states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
29. In general, proportionate additions would be no greater than a 50% increase in volume to the original building, taking into account the volume of the building as constructed and the volume of any extensions to it. However, the overall scale and massing are also important considerations when considering whether extensions are proportionate to the original building and there may be instances where an addition of less than 50% in volume is not acceptable due to its scale, massing and bulk.
30. As such, the proposed extensions in addition to any previous extensions must be less than 50% of the volume of the original dwelling, whilst also not appearing as disproportionate by reason of its appearance. This figure of 50% is not necessarily a definitive cut off point but represents an established process based upon an internal procedure note and numerous appeal decisions from the Planning Inspectorate across the Borough, and allows consistency on decision-making.

31. The building to be extended was originally erected as garaging to the bungalow when built originally as part of permission 80/06031/HIST. The use of this structure was then changed to a 'kindergarten' under permission 88/01149/D1P, with an extension to this measuring some 8m by 3m approved under permission 89/01097/D1P. Further extensions were refused under application 96/01120/FUL due to concerns relating to impact on the green belt. The use of the building as 4 holiday lets, along with a further extension was permitted in 2016 under permission reference 16/01275/FUL.
32. In this case, the building was extended when it was converted from a day nursery to holiday lets as well as prior to this when it was originally converted from a garage/store to a Kindergarten. As such the building as seen on site today has already been extended by 45.4% (volume). Together with the previous extension, the proposed extension would result in an increase of around 114.5% (volume) which, it is considered, would clearly represent a disproportionate addition to the original building.
33. In short, the calculations are as follows:
- Original Volume c.348.8 cubic meters.
 - Existing Volume c.507.2 cubic meters 45.4% increase to original.
 - Proposed Volume c.748.2 cubic meters.114.5% increase to original.
34. As such, the proposed development must be considered to represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt which would be by nature harmful to the Green Belt and as set out in paragraph 152 of the NPPF, should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Design and Amenity

35. The design and materials would be similar to the existing building, utilising a slight step to the front elevation and set down to the roof, along with a change in materials from brick to cladding to identify a degree of subservience to the existing structure. It is considered that the proposed development would be sympathetic to the character of the site and surroundings. In view of the adjacent and nearby uses, it is not considered that the extension and associated intensification of use would raise any significant amenity issues.

Highways

36. Vehicular access to the site is from the original Nottingham Road (prior to dualling of the A46 and realignment of this section of Nottingham Road) and only the application site and adjacent petrol filling/service station are served by this original section of highway. Only traffic in connection with the application site uses this short section of road to the east of the petrol fulling/service station, and visibility at the access is good. There is also an adequate hard surfaced/parking area within the site to accommodate any limited additional parking in connection with the proposed development. In view of the above and having referred to the Standing Advice referred to above by the Highway Authority, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse impact on highway safety.

Very Special Circumstances and Conclusions

37. Paragraph 153 of the NPPF advises that: "When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." This national policy advice is reinforced within policy 21 of the LPP2, which states that applications for development within the Green Belt should be determined in line with the NPPF.
38. As outlined in paragraph 5 above, the applicant considers that the support of tourism/leisure and rural growth, with its associated economic benefits, and the provision of overnight accommodation suitable for a range of end users including those with disabilities and their carers would represent very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development and outweigh the totality of harm. No specific information demonstrating a general demand for such accessible accommodation in this location, noting the sites separation from any surrounding facilities, has been presented. These matters have been considered very carefully and can be attributed weight in the decision making process. These matters would be considered to provide some modest economic and social benefits through the provision of such accommodation supporting the rural economy, and the provision of a more specialist accommodation offering.
39. The benefits of the scheme must be weighed against harm to the Green Belt and also any other 'harms' arising. In terms of Green Belt harm, the extension would represent inappropriate development, by definition harmful to the green belt, with the scheme resulting in a degree of impact on the openness of the Green Belt given the encroachment of built form within the countryside contrary to the 5 purposes of the green belt. The changes would be permanent, and whilst well screened the changes would be perceptible. No other harms have been identified.
40. In summary, the proposed development is inappropriate development and is therefore harmful by definition. Substantial weight is attached to that harm. Against the totality of the harm, the above factors have been identified which weigh in support of the scheme. It is however not considered that these factors would together represent Very Special Circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harms arising.
41. It is, therefore, considered that the proposed development would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that there are no very special circumstance to justify the development or to outweigh harm to the Green Belt.
42. The application was not subject to pre-application discussions. The applicant was informed during processing of the application that the proposal could not be supported in its current form and was given the opportunity to amend the proposal. However, the applicant wishes for the application to determined as originally submitted.

RECOMMENDATION

It is RECOMMENDED that planning permission be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and therefore, it would not accord with the exemption set out under Paragraph 154 Part C of the National Planning Policy Framework. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 21 (Green Belt) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies and the National Planning Policy Framework Section 13 (Protecting Green Belt Land), particularly paragraphs 152 through to 154.

A decision to refuse planning permission would accord with paragraph 152 which states 'Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.'