

# 18/01705/OUT

**Applicant** Mr & Mrs Horner

**Location** Land Adjacent To 63 Moor Lane, Gotham, Nottinghamshire

**Proposal** Outline application for proposed erection of one detached dwelling with new access.

**Ward** Gotham

## LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Consultee

**RECEIVED FROM:** Environmental Health

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- No objections raised.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Consultee

**RECEIVED FROM:** Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board

### **SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- The site is outside of the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and there are no board watercourses in close proximity to the site.
- The erection or alteration of any mill dam, weir or other obstruction to the flow or erection of any culvert temporary or permanent within the channel of a riparian watercourse will require the Boards prior written consent.
- Surface water run off rates to receiving watercourses must not be increased as a result of the development.
- The design, operation and future maintenance of site drainage systems must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and Local Planning Authority.

### **PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

There are no further comments to add.

**3. NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Statement in support of the application

**RECEIVED FROM:** The Applicant ( full statement available online)

**SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:**

- There is no specific definition of limited infilling but nonetheless the width and distance from the road are deemed too large in the report
- There seem to be many definitions and in some cases many variants of 'limited infilling'
- It is not the case that if a proposal meets one of the exception criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018 it also has to be shown that very special circumstances exist
- The Gotham Neighbourhood Plan was submitted in June and will be open for the final 6 week consultation on the 19th before it is inspected. So obviously carries some weight
- A recent application for infill in the green belt was given permission where the frontage was 150m
- Similarly at 16 Loughborough Road, Bunny, in this case there was no mention of gap size but the proposal was found to be limited infill in the Green Belt where the frontage was 46 metres and 35 metres from the road
- The report states that the open countryside begins beyond the last house on Moor Lane, the main consideration is actually whether the proposal is for limited infill in villages in which case there is no need to consider the effect on the openness of the Green Belt
- The proposal meets the NPPF Green Belt exception criteria for limited infill in villages
- Side spacing will be maintained in accordance with the Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide

**PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:**

It is accepted that there are many different variants in defining the term 'limited infilling' and that neither local nor national planning policy gives a specific measurement for gap sizes in terms of what is deemed to be limited infilling and what is not. The Planning Portal Glossary defines it as 'the development of a relatively small gap between existing buildings', however this is treated as a guide and again is not specific in terms of actual distance. As this is the case it is therefore treating each case on its own merit and each case will be assessed separately to determine whether it constitutes limited infilling.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF outlines that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved unless in very special circumstances. Officers do not consider that this case represents very special circumstances. The NPPF also outlines limited infilling in villages as an exception to inappropriate development in the NPPF. As mentioned above each case is treated differently for limited infilling and as

mentioned in the main report the proposal does not constitute limited infilling due to the size of the plot and the location of the plot therefore in conflict with the exception criteria outlined in the NPPF. As such it would impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal has been designed to reflect the design of the host property at 63 Moor Lane. However this property was only allowed on the condition it was used as an agricultural farmers dwelling which is deemed an exception for residential development in the Green Belt. The proposal would bridge a substantial gap between the host property at number 63 and the neighbouring property on the other side at 'Redroofs'. This would impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the views of the countryside to the rear of the site which can currently be viewed from Moor Lane.

This isn't the last property on the road before entering the open countryside however the plot is very much on the edge of the village. As mentioned in the main report Local Plan Part 2 intends to inset Gotham from the Green Belt, however it is only the main built up area of Gotham with this plot falling outside of this area therefore due to remain in the Green Belt. It is accepted that this has not been formally adopted as yet so carried little weight but it gives an indication of the value of the site in retaining it within the Green Belt and that it would not constitute the main built up core of the village. Likewise the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan cannot be given much weight at this stage even though as mentioned in the applicant's statement this plot has been earmarked in that plan as a potential development site for future housing.

The statement references a recent approval for residential development in Bunny, also in the Green Belt. The site is 15 Church Street, Bunny (ref no 18/01489/FUL). This site is in the centre of the village of Bunny and not bordering any open countryside. The width of the plot facing the road is wide but it is not a very deep plot. The main village of Bunny, just like with Gotham is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt as outlined in the Green Belt Review forming part of the new draft Local Plan. This site falls within the area to be inset and the review considers this area does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt.

Another recent approval mentioned was at 16 Loughborough Road, Bunny (ref no 17/03038/FUL). Again this site was in the built up core of the village of Bunny where it is proposed to be inset from the Green Belt as outlined in the Green Belt Review.