



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2025

by **Les Greenwood MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/W/25/3361852

145 Main Street, Calverton, Nottinghamshire NG14 6FE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs D Henson against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/0687.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an agricultural field barn.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. Although the site address is listed on the appeal documents as 145 Main Street, the application form confirms that the appeal relates to land to the rear of a recently constructed house at No 147, where the appellants live. From my observations at the site visit, the appeal site appears to be closely associated with No 147. There is no clear fence line between that house and the site, which is fenced off from No 145.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Calverton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The land rises sharply to the rear of 147 Main Street, with steps up to a sloping, mown grass area with a few young fruit trees near the lower end and a gated access from a track at the top. It sits within the village conservation area. The proposal is to build a long timber barn with a corrugated roof on the upper part of the site, for storage of agricultural implements and materials plus a sheep pen.
5. The Council's Calverton Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CA) identifies the site and surrounding land as an important area of open space, together with the adjacent James Seeley Playing Field and the largely undeveloped pieces of land to the rear of 137 to 145 Main Street. The CAA advises that the areas of land to the rear of those properties are some of the few remaining survivors of the traditional long plots, that once characterised the village. These plots are important for their contribution to the remaining rural aspect of this area and to views from the top of the playing field and Main Street.

6. As is well documented in the comments of the Council's Conservation Officer, the appeal site was once part of a large field next to No 145. Much or all of this land was apparently split into what is now the land at No 147 and the playing field sometime in the late 19th or early 20th Century, but still remains open in character. The appeal site is thus part of a historically open area of land on the fringe of the village. In combination with the land to the rear of Nos 137 to 145, it has heritage significance as a valuable part of the village's rural setting.
7. The barn would not be tall and its functional design, timber construction and agricultural use would to some extent help it to fit into the semi-rural scene. It would nevertheless be a sizeable, elongated structure sitting across the contour lines of the slope. I have no details as to how this change in levels would be dealt with. If part of the building would need to be raised above ground level, as seems likely, this would increase its physical presence. The proposal would bring built development into this mainly undeveloped, open area. It would be widely seen, from Main Street, from the playing field, the lane and the cricket field further up the hill, intruding into some of the key views identified in the CA.
8. There are a few listed buildings in the local area, including 135 Main Street, but these are far enough away, with intervening features, so that the barn would not significantly affect their settings. The Council refers to an appeal decision refusing permission for residential development at the back of No 135¹, but that was a very different and more substantial proposal on a different site. On the other hand, I note that sizeable play equipment has recently been constructed in the playing field next door. This is much lower down the slope and I have no details of that planning application. I have assessed this proposal on its own merits.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area due to the building's intrusive siting and its scale. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy 11 of the Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan, policies LPD26 and LPD28 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan and policy BE5 of the Calverton Neighbourhood Plan, which aim to protect the historic environment in general and the Calverton Conservation Area in particular.
10. In coming to this conclusion, I give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area as required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The harm to the conservation area, in the terms of Framework paragraph 212, would be 'less than substantial' and towards the lower end of that broad scale of harm. I nevertheless give great weight to this matter as required by paragraph 212.
11. Framework paragraph 215 says that where a proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The agricultural use, maintenance and management of land like this on the fringe of the village is of public benefit in that it is a valued part of the rural character of the edge of village and conservation area. This on its own is a very small parcel of agricultural land, however, and I have not seen any convincing justification for the scale and position of the barn.

¹ APP/N3020/W/23/3317847

12. The appeal site is also in the designated Green Belt, where policies are generally restrictive, allowing for certain specified categories of development only. Agricultural buildings are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Like the Council, therefore, I find no objection in this regard. This is a neutral factor in my assessment.
13. I find that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm caused to the significance of a heritage asset, so that the test set out at Framework paragraph 215 would not be met. The proposal conflicts with the development plan for the area. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR