

Planning  
Ashfield District Council  
Urban Road  
Kirkby in Ashfield  
NG17 8DA

24<sup>th</sup> June 2021

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Outline Application with Some Matters Reserved for a Maximum of 2 Dwellings. Linby Boarding  
Kennels, Church Lane, Hucknall. V/2021/0445.**

Urban Vision Enterprise CIC has been appointed by Linby Parish Council to submit representations with regard to the above development (Reference V/2021/0445).

**Grounds of Objection**

We would recommend the proposal be refused on the following grounds:

- The development would be inappropriate development in the green belt by virtue of the change of use from commercial business of boarding kennel to residential development. The proposed change of use is not compatible with uses considered appropriate in the green belt;
- The scheme builds upon a recent adjacent permission for 9 units in the same ownership on adjoining land. It would appear that this subsequent application would enable additional development, further increasing the impact on the green belt;
- The red line of the proposed development overlaps the red line of the granted scheme reference V/2020/0855, reducing the vehicular access point;
- The proposed development for 2 new dwellings is contrary to policies ST2, ST4 and EV1 in the adopted local plan by virtue that it is development outside of the main urban area and not within one of the sites allocated for housing; and

- The proposed development would set a precedent for inappropriate development in the green belt.

## National Planning Policy Framework

Chapter 5 deals with delivering a sufficient supply of homes.

Paragraph 79 identifies criteria where decisions should be made on rural housing:

*“Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:*

*a) there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside;*

*b) the development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets;*

*c) the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting;*

*d) the development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential dwelling; or*

*e) the design is of exceptional quality, in that it:*

*- is truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and*

*- would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.*

This scheme fails to meet any of the identified criteria and therefore does not make the case for very special circumstances.

Chapter 13 deals with Protecting green belt land.

Paragraph 143 states:

*“Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.”*

The development proposal does not constitute exceptional circumstances. Paragraph 145 sets out exceptions to inappropriate development. Currently the site includes an operational business of boarding kennels. This proposal to redevelop the site for a small-scale housing development in the green belt it does not provide a reason to depart from national planning policy.

The site is the urban fringe to the urban conurbation of Hucknall and the landscape quality of the application site is poor. It should be noted that landscape quality is not one of the purposes for green belts set out in the NPPF. There are other designations that relate to landscape quality, none of which apply to the site. Put simply, this scheme constitutes inappropriate development in the green belt.

Approval of the application would set a precedent for inappropriate development in the green belt. There is no justification in this application to support exceptional circumstances.

## **Adopted Local Plan, November 2002**

Using the interactive policies map the following policies were identified:

**Policy ST2 (Main Urban Area)** identifies where development should be concentrated, focuses within the main urban area. The proposed development is located outside of this identified area and is therefore not considered to be a sustainable location. The development is contrary to this policy.

**Policy ST4 (The Remainder of the District)** makes clear outside of the main urban area where development would be acceptable. The development proposal fails to meet both policy tests by virtue that it is not a site allocated for development and it is not a development considered appropriate for the green belt.

**Policy EV1 (Green Belt)** sets clear criteria for when development would be acceptable in the green belt. The proposed development does not meet any of the criteria as it is not for agriculture or forestry and essential facility, limited extension or re-use of existing buildings. The proposed development is contrary to this policy.

## **Other Material Considerations**

When comparing the approved indicative layout referenced 'Indicative Layout, Revision C' and the site location plan referenced 'Site Location, Revision C' relating to the application V/2020/0855 together with the site location plan referenced 'Site Location Plan Revision A' of this application. It is apparent that the proposed development would overlap the vehicular access for the permission relating to V/2020/0855.

It would appear from comparing the plans the highways access has been reduced and highway safety comprised by the siting of the proposed development in this application. Therefore, we recommend the development be refused due to impact on highway safety, not to prejudice the granted development on adjoining land.

## **Conclusions**

The proposal fails to meet the requirements of national policy and local plan policy, as set out in this representation. It would be inappropriate development in the green belt, that would set a precedent.

Furthermore, the proposed development would also prejudice the highway access and therefore highway safety for the application referenced V/2020/0855 recently granted consent.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'HLB', is positioned below the 'Yours faithfully' text.

Hannah Barter  
Director