



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2023

by G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/22/3312259

Land adjacent to Willowdene, 9 Beckingham Road, Coddington, Nottinghamshire NG24 2QS

- 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 J L Phillips against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00120/FULM, dated 10 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is new hay and equipment/machinery store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have amended the address on the banner heading above from that given on the application form to reflect the appeal documentation which more clearly identifies the appeal site.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be essential to meet an agricultural need.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a field on the eastern side of the village of Coddington which is accessed from Beckingham Road. The site adjoins dwellings to the west but there are fields to all other sides.
5. The proposed single storey building would be situated in the south east corner of the field. It is described as a hay/machinery store to allow the secure storage of hay produced from the field and equipment related to the maintenance of the land. The appellant recently purchased the field from a local farmer and has now taken over its management. The appellant suggests that between 2-3 cuts could be made a year with the previous farmer suggesting that up to 750-1000 bales could be produced for each cut.
6. The site lies outside of any established settlement boundaries and is therefore considered to be in open countryside. Development in the countryside is strictly controlled and must be proven to be necessary in order to be permitted. Policy DM8 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD 2013 (DPD) and Spatial Policy 3 of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy 2019 (ACS) allow for agricultural development in the open countryside subject to a

demonstrated need. DPD Policy DM8 requires applicants to explain the need for the development, together with justification of its siting and scale in relation to the use it is intended to serve.

7. Although the appellant has reduced the size of the building to the minimum considered necessary for its purpose, the building remains large in relation to the size of the single field. With no livestock the hay produced would be sold, and I have seen no adequate evidence to justify either the number of bales which could be produced or to fully explain why it would need to be stored on site prior to its sale, including evidence of price variations. There is also an inadequate explanation as to how the specified machinery/equipment is all necessary for the maintenance of this land and how this would justify the size of building proposed. Based on the evidence before me, I'm not convinced that the proposal would be necessary for the proper functioning of the agricultural land which it serves.
8. The appeal statement referred to by the appellant relates to land in the Green Belt where different national and local planning policies apply. In addition, I cannot be sure that this example shares the same site characteristics with the appeal proposal before me and I am not persuaded that it is comparable. It therefore is not determinative on the case before me, and I have determined the appeal proposal on its own merits and on the evidence before me.
9. There would be some modest benefits to the local rural economy from the proposed development. However, given the scale of the building and its use the benefits would be small and not outweigh the concerns in relation to the need for the building.
10. Regardless of the position of the building within the field and its design or colour, I conclude that the agricultural need for a building of this size in this location has not been adequately demonstrated. It would therefore be in conflict with ACS Spatial Policy 3 and DPD Policy DM8. It would also conflict with the principles of sustainable development in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework).

Other Matters

11. The appellant has expressed concerns regarding a lack of communication with the Council and an absence of positive and proactive working. Whilst this must have caused the appellant some distress, this does not materially affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Having considered all other matters raised I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

G Bayliss

INSPECTOR