

24/00603/FUL

Applicant Mr C OGrady

Location Fields Farm, Barton Lane, Thrumpton

Proposal Demolition of existing extension and detached outbuilding, Erect two 2 storey side extensions, single storey rear extension, rear dormer windows replacement bay windows to front.

Ward Gotham

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Details of the application can be found [here](#)

1. The application site - Fields Farm, is a two-storey detached dwelling located within the Green Belt, on the north-western side of Barton Lane, to the east of Thrumpton. The application site is also located within Thrumpton Conservation Area. Adjoining neighbours are comprised of a complex of farm buildings converted to dwellings to the east.
2. The dwelling has been extended through the addition of single storey side and rear extensions. The volume of the original building is approximately 539.98 cubic metres.
3. The site is located within the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

4. Planning permission is sought for 2No. two-storey side extensions, single storey rear extension, replace the front bay windows and new rear facing dormer windows.
5. The proposed rear extension would have flat roof and would measure 3.36m in depth, 6.84m in width and 3.0m in height.
6. The proposed side extensions would have pitched roof and a rear facing dormer each, would measure 3.22m in width, 3.84m in depth, 5.55m at eaves height and 8.3m at ridge height.
7. Two dormer windows are proposed to be inserted into the roof on the rear elevation of the main roof.
8. The proposed replacement bay windows would be squared and would have flat roof.
9. The proposal was amended during the course of the assessment to omit the originally proposed gates and pillars and amend the site area.

SITE HISTORY

10. 75/02557/HIST - Erect stable block – GRANTED
11. 81/00454/SOUTH - Use barn as workshop and yard as lorry park – REFUSED
12. 83/07426/HIST - Use of farm outbuildings as a spanish guitar centre – GRANTED
13. 87/00358/G1P - Retention of caravan for kennel maid – GRANTED
14. 89/00763/G1P - Convert and extend barns to form 2 dwellings; form new vehicular accesses – GRANTED
15. 89/00835/G1P - Demolish two agricultural barns – GRANTED
16. 90/00107/G1P - Convert and extend barns to form 1 dwelling; new vehicular access (Revised Proposal) – GRANTED
17. 23/02070/FUL - Demolition of existing extension and detached outbuilding, Erect two 2 storey side extensions, single storey rear extension, single storey link garage, rear dormer window. Erection of new walls and gates to front access/boundary – WITHDRAWN
18. 23/02093/RELDDEM - Demolition of existing extension and detached outbuilding - WITHDRAWN

REPRESENTATIONS

Ward Councillor(s)

19. One Ward Councillor (Cllr R Walker) – In my view the key aspects of this application are the impact upon the Thrumpton Conservation Area and whether or not the proposals meet the exception for inappropriate development in the green belt at paragraph 149(c) of the NPPF - 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.

The views of the relevant Conservation Officer at the Council would be welcome here. Whilst the site is within the Conservation area, to my mind the site is clearly outside of the village and thus debateable the extent to which this building makes a positive contribution to the Area.

The Parish Meeting have a settled position that they wish to support developments that allow growing and changing families to stay in the village and are aware that this could see proposals which exceed the Borough's 50% 'rule of thumb' view on disproportionate additions. The ad hoc extensions are of limited value from a design perspective. The proposed replacements would be an improvement. With the information available I do not object to the application.

20. One Ward Councillor (Cllr A Brown) – No objection.

Town/Parish Council

21. Thrumpton Parish Meeting is keen to support small-scale modifications or extensions to village properties which help accommodate the changing needs and circumstances of residents particularly where that allows residents and their families to remain within the village. To support these aims we are developing a Neighbourhood Plan for Thrumpton to provide more flexibility for these types of small-scale changes given our greenbelt and conservation area setting and formally set out what this means for our Parish. This is under development. We therefore support this application.

Statutory and Other Consultees

Rushcliffe Borough Council

22. The Borough Conservation Officer - The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I consider the harm to be harm at the lower end of the less than substantial scale. As a result, the proposal would fail to achieve the objective described as desirable within Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area and would thus engage a strong and statutory presumption against granting planning permission. As the level of harm is considered less than substantial permission could still be granted if it is concluded that public benefits outweigh harm through application of the test within Paragraph 208 of the NPPF (rev Dec 2023). The proposed development is also likely to affect existing trees.

Nottinghamshire County Council

23. Nottinghamshire County Council Highways Authority - The Highway Authority had no objections in principle to the extensions to the building as they have no highway implications. Notwithstanding this, the plans showed gates installed on the vehicle access points. These will need to be set back a minimum of 6 metres from the carriageway edge to allow a vehicle to pull clear of the live carriageway to operate the gates. We recommend that either the plans are revised to reflect the gates being set back, or that a condition is required on the planning approval stating that no gates are to be erected within 6 metres of the back edge of the carriageway.
24. Nottinghamshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) - Having considered the scale of this application the LLFA believes it is not required to respond to this application. However, as a general guide the following points are recommended for all developments:
1. The development should not increase flood risk to existing properties or put the development at risk of flooding.
 2. Any discharge of surface water from the site should look at infiltration – watercourse – sewer as the priority order for discharge location.
 3. SUDS should be considered where feasible and consideration given to ownership and maintenance of any SUDS proposals for the lifetime of the development.
 4. Any development that proposes to alter an ordinary watercourse in a manner that will have a detrimental effect on the flow of water (eg culverting / pipe crossing) must be discussed with the Flood Risk Management Team at Nottinghamshire County Council.

Local Residents and the General Public

25. Letters have been sent to neighbouring residents and a site notice posted at the site. No letters of representation were received as a result.

PLANNING POLICY

26. The Development Plan for Rushcliffe consists of The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (LPP1) and the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance).

Relevant National Planning Policies and Guidance

27. The relevant policy considerations in the NPPF (2023) are:
- Paragraph 11c)
 - Chapter 12 (Achieving well- designed and beautiful places)
 - Chapter 13 (Protecting Green Belt land)
 - Chapter 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change)
 - Chapter 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment)

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

Relevant Local Planning Policies and Guidance

28. The relevant policy considerations in the LPP1 are:
- Policy 1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
 - Policy 2 (Climate Change)
 - Policy 3 (Spatial Strategy)
 - Policy 4 (Nottingham-Derby Green Belt)
 - Policy 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity)
 - Policy 11 (Historic Environment)
 - Policy 17 (Biodiversity)
29. The relevant policy considerations in the LPP2 are:
- Policy 1 (Development Requirements)
 - Policy 12 (Housing Standards)
 - Policy 17 (Managing Flood Risk)
 - Policy 18 (Surface Water Management)
 - Policy 21 (Green Belt)
 - Policy 28 (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets)
 - Policy 37 (Trees and Woodlands)
 - Policy 38 (Non-designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network)
30. The Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide and Thrumpton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan is also a material consideration.
31. The full text of the policies in the LPP1 and LPP2, together with the supporting

text can be found in the Local Plan documents on the Council's website at: [Planning Policy - Rushcliffe Borough Council](#)

32. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990) also requires Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

APPRAISAL

33. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework 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.
34. The main issues in the consideration of the application are:
- Whether the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt
 - Impact on heritage assets and visual amenity
 - Impact on residential amenity
 - Flood risk
 - Biodiversity net gain

Green Belt

35. The application site is set within the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt. Policy 4 of the LPP1 reinforces the principle of the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt.
36. Policy 21 of the LPP2 sets out that applications for development in the Green Belt will be determined in accordance with the NPPF.
36. Paragraph 142 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.'*
37. Paragraph 143 goes on to state the five purposes of the Green Belt:
- 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.*
38. Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that *'inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances'*. Paragraph 153 states *'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.'* Paragraph 154 states that a local planning authority should

regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt with a few exceptions amongst which one relates to extensions and alterations to a building provided that it does not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building (subparagraph c).

39. Rushcliffe Borough Council has an internal guidance note that extensions of up to 50% cubic volume increase may be considered 'not disproportionate' where the scale and massing are also acceptable. The building on site has been extended in the past however, the proposed development would involve the removal of the existing extensions.
40. The proposed extensions would have a cumulative volume of approximately 387.84 cubic metres which would represent 71.8% additional volume above that of the original building. This would be significantly above the Council's threshold for extensions in the Green Belt and as such, it is considered the proposed extensions would result in a disproportionate addition to the original building and would therefore be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Given the scale, massing and location proposed it is considered the harm to the openness of the Green Belt to be moderate.
41. Nevertheless, inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and therefore can only be approved in very special circumstances. No very special circumstances have been provided in this case that would clearly outweigh the harm identified to the Green Belt and therefore the proposal is contrary to Section 13 of the NPPF and Policy 21 of the Local Plan. The comments from Cllr Walker and the Parish Meeting, in relation to the changing needs of families and allowing them to stay in the village are noted however these reasons are not considered to be exceptional circumstances to justify going against the National Policy and the Council's assessment of the proposal in respect of the proposal constituting inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Thrumpton does not have a Neighbourhood Plan and therefore the position put forward does not form part of the Development Plan nor a material consideration.
42. Given the matters as outlined above, it is considered that the proposed development does not demonstrate that very special circumstances exist that would clearly outweigh the harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As such the proposal would be contrary to the aims of Policy 21 of the LPP2 and Section 13 of the NPPF.
43. Any other harm will be considered later in the report.

Heritage assets and visual amenity

44. Paragraph 201 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. Paragraph 205 goes on to state that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

45. Significance is described in the NPPF as being the value a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.
46. Paragraph 208 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
47. Paragraph 209 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
48. Policy 11 of the Rushcliffe LPP1 sets out that proposals and initiatives will be supported where the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings are conserved and/or enhanced in line with their interest and significance. Policy 28 of the Local Plan Part 2 states that proposals affecting heritage assets and/or its setting will be considered against the following criteria:
 - a) The significance of the asset;
 - b) Whether the proposals would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the asset and any feature of special historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological interest that it possesses;
 - c) Whether the proposals would conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset by virtue of siting, scale, building form, massing, height, materials and quality of detail;
 - d) Whether the proposals would respect the asset's relationship with the historic street pattern, topography, urban spaces, landscape, views and landmarks;
 - e) Whether the proposals would contribute to the long-term maintenance and management of the asset; and
 - f) Whether the proposed use is compatible with the asset.
49. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990) requires Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
50. The proposal relates to a late Victorian traditional red brick slate farmhouse at Fields Farm within the Thrumpton Conservation Area. The dwelling dates from 1881, as evidenced by the datestone, and it retains many period features such as terracotta mouldings making up a string course and brick detailing to the eaves, a front projecting two-storey gable with porch at ground level, arched headers to large windows and decorative chimney stacks to the gable ends. The farmhouse is set within a large plot surrounded by mature trees and hedges to the north-east, east and south-west boundaries and a timber garden fence to the north-west boundary. Views across the open countryside are possible to and from the application site which sits alongside Barton Lane, the road leading to and from the village. The dwelling is not an identified positive

building according to the Appraisal plan for the Conservation Area, however it does make a strong positive contribution to the Conservation Area given the architectural and historic interest of the dwelling and it is a non-designated heritage asset.

51. The significance of the dwelling derives from its late 19th century origins, layout and plan form, use of vernacular materials and detailing and retention of historic fabric and features. The dwelling also derives significance from its historic function as a former farmhouse with its adjacent former agricultural ranges and its likely connection with Lord Belper of nearby Kingston Hall given the inscribed datestone and the large estate in the local area known to have been associated with him.
52. The farmhouse is reflective of the historic settlement pattern and the agricultural nature of the village thus positively contributing to the street scene and the character and appearance of the Thrumpton Conservation Area. The proposal would be highly visible from the public realm from the roadside approach along Barton Lane and across the open countryside.
53. The proposed form, including scale and massing for the two proposed side extensions is considered too large and would appear disproportionate to the scale of the 1881 farmhouse and as such the proposed side extensions would not have a subordinate appearance. The location to either side of the host dwelling would enhance the disproportionality and lack of subservience appearance by dominating the main elevation which would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
54. The proposed side extensions are not considered acceptable and any views or glimpses from or into the Conservation Area would be affected in a way that could harm the special interest of the Conservation Area. As such, it is considered the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The harm is considered to be harm at the lower end of the less than substantial scale. Paragraph 208 of the NPPF advises that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
55. No justification has been provided for the proposed development and whilst it is concluded in the Heritage Statement submitted that the proposal would not result in any harm to any heritage assets, the Local Planning Authority considers the proposal would be harmful to the Conservation Area. It is considered, given the private residential use of the application site, no public benefits would derive from the proposal and therefore the proposed development is contrary to paragraph 208 of the NPPF, Policies 10 and 11 of the LPP1 and Policies 1 and 28 of the LPP2.
56. The replacement of the two bay windows is considered acceptable as these are of no special interest themselves as they are later additions. The proposed rear extension and dormer would also be acceptable, given their location to the rear, scale and design.
57. Whilst amendments are suggested by the Conservation Officer in order to address concerns, it is considered these would not outweigh other reasons for

refusal explained above in the report.

Residential amenity

58. The proposal comprises extensions to the side and rear, and the replacement of the front bay windows. The distance to the side boundary with the converted to residential complex of farm buildings would be approximately 4.65m and the proposed side extensions would have no windows in the side elevation at first floor. The application site is adjoined by other residential properties only to the north-east.
59. It is considered, given the scale, design and location of the proposed extensions, relationship with adjoining properties and separation distance, the proposed development would not result in a significantly undue overlooking overbearing and overshadowing impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of any adjoining property, in accordance with the NPPF and Policy 10 of the LPP1 and Policy 1 of the LPP2.

Flood Risk

60. The application site is located within flood zone 2 which has a medium probability of flooding from rivers and the sea. A flood risk assessment has been carried out and submitted with the proposal and the proposed extensions are shown to have the finished floor level no lower than the existing level of the host dwelling. As such it is considered the proposed development and its occupants would be safe from flood risk over the lifetime of the development. The proposal is in accordance with Policy 17 of the Local Plan Part 2.

Trees

61. With regards to trees, the proposed side extension to the south-west would be located at approximately 11 metres from the south-western boundary where the Leylandii trees are located. The comments from the Conservation Officer with regards to potential impact on trees are noted, however, given the distance, it is considered the trees would unlikely be affected by the proposed development.

Biodiversity net gain

62. Under Regulation 5 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024 the statutory biodiversity gain condition required by Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) does not apply in relation to planning permission for development which inter alia is the subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Conclusions

63. Negotiations have taken place during the consideration of the application. Whilst some amendments have been made to the proposal for clarification purposes this has not addressed the fundamental objection to the proposal and therefore the application is recommended to refuse planning permission.

64. Taking the above into account, it is considered that the development would result in a disproportionate addition over and above the original building and would therefore be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Without very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the harm to the green belt identified the proposal is considered to be contrary to Section 13 of the NPPF and Policy 21 of the Local Plan Part 2. It has also been found that the proposal, by virtue of the side extensions would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Section 16 of the NPPF, Policies 10 and 11 of the LPP1 and Policies 1 and 28 of the LPP2 and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

RECOMMENDATION

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

- 1. The proposed development would result in disproportionate additions over and above the original building and would therefore be inappropriate in the Green Belt. Very special circumstances have not been demonstrated to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness or other harms identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 152, 153 and 154) and Policy 21 (Green Belt) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2.**
- 2. The proposed side extensions are not considered to be acceptable in form, layout and scale. Any views or glimpses from or into the Thrumpton Conservation Area would be affected in a way that would harm the special interest of the Conservation Area, and therefore it is considered the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The less than substantial level of harm identified would not be outweighed by any demonstrated public benefits and therefore the proposed development is contrary to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 205, 208 and 209), Policies 10 (Design and Enhancing Local Identity) and 11 (Historic Environment) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1 and Policies 1 (Development Requirements) and 28 (Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets) of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2.**