



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/20/3262898

Redroofs Farm, Great North Road, Weston, Nottinghamshire NG23 6TS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Rodgers against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01157/FULM, dated 30 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of agricultural building to accommodate tractors and implement with secure workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether there is a demonstrable agricultural need for the construction of a storage building in this location.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a plot to the eastern side of the Great North Road and is part of the larger development of Redroofs Farm. The locality is in the vicinity and a number of farm buildings and holdings, but is within the open countryside, markedly separate from the settlements of Weston and Sutton on Trent.
4. The appeal seeks the construction of a building to house vintage tractors and would also include a workshop. It would be an inverted 'U' shape and have a footprint of approximately 190m² and be constructed of brick and tile construction with timber barn doors. The appellant states that it is to house items currently kept in storage.
5. It is apparent from the evidence in front of me that the crux of the matter is whether there is an agricultural justification for the building. There is considerable planning history on the site including an extant permission for stables and a hay store, and a recent agricultural prior notification for equipment and machinery in relation to the agricultural land.
6. I find that the location for the building, to the front of the existing dwelling, close to the main highway, separated by considerable distance from the agricultural enterprise, to weigh against the proposals, as well as the fact that construction materials proposed would be more domestic in nature than being in relation to an agricultural business, and I find that the building would be

more for the personal needs of the appellant rather than the agricultural enterprise.

7. From its size, design and location, I have found that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. Whilst the Appellant has submitted some details to establish a functional need for a storage building, they do not convincingly demonstrate that other less harmful options are not available to meet this need. Whilst the proposed development would not materially harm the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings, this does not outweigh the harm caused.
8. There is limited evidence in front of me of the level of agricultural activity within the site itself. While I have no doubt that the proposed building has been specifically designed for the storage of the equipment concerned, I have only limited information before me in respect of the current nature of the agricultural use. The machinery proposed to be housed in the building does not offer sufficient evidence.
9. No detailed maps have been provided in respect of the location of the current land holdings and uses, and its accessibility from the appeal site. Nor has any detailed information been provided in respect of any rented land, in respect of its location, size, use and any details of any rental agreement or timescales for this.
10. The submitted details contain little analysis of whether the Appellant's need for additional storage could not be less harmfully met through the use of one or more buildings elsewhere within the Appellant's land holdings. As a result, it is not clear that the locational need for a building of this size and impact on this site is sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified earlier. I find that a justified and functional need for the specific building proposed has not been established.
11. Having carefully balanced the arguments in support of and against the proposal I conclude, in the absence of a clearer justification for a building of this size within the appeal site, the harm caused by the proposal would outweigh its benefits. Whilst the proposal would, by supporting a rural enterprise, bring material benefits, it would also bring material harm which is not adequately justified.
12. As a result, I find the proposals in conflict with Policy SP3 of the Amended Core Strategy (2019) and policies DM5 and DM8 of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) which, when taken as a whole, expect development to not have a detrimental impact on the character of the location and explain its need, siting and scale in relation to the use it is to serve.
13. While I accept that the Government is supportive of rural farming and productivity, there is little information before me in respect of the agricultural enterprise and I share the Council's concerns in terms of how the use of the storage building would impact on the use of the overall site for agriculture.
14. I have noted the appeal decision forwarded by the appellant in support of the proposal, but I do not have full details of the proposal, and I have no idea of site circumstances or details of the location. I have to assess the proposal in

front of me on its own merits, and I have identified harm that works against the proposals based on the information in front of me.

15. I have taken into consideration the planning history of the site, and what is/has been approved on the site previously. However, I find the harm that I have identified outweighs the fallback case identified by the appellant.

Conclusion

16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR