



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/25/3368293

Flaggs Farm, Cauntton Road, Norwell, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6LB

- 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 Pete Cook against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01810/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use of two former farm storage buildings to storage (Use Class B8).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of two former farm storage buildings to storage (Use Class B8) at Flaggs Farm, Cauntton Road, Norwell, NG23 6LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01810/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos Site Location Plan (ref: 0155-03 Rev C); Block Plan (ref: 0155-02 Rev D).
 - 2) The premises shall be used for Use Class B8 and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class B of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).
 - 3) The use hereby permitted shall only operate between the following hours:
08:00 - 18:00 Mondays - Fridays
08:00 - 13:00 Saturdays.
No operation on Sundays and on Bank or Public holidays.
 - 4) The vehicle parking and turning facilities shown on the approved Block Plan (ref: 0155-02 Rev D) shall be retained for the parking and turning of vehicles for the lifetime of the development and shall not be used for any other purpose.
 - 5) Within 6 months of the date of this permission, the access shall be surfaced in a hard, bound material for a minimum distance of 20m behind the adopted highway boundary and shall be maintained thus for the lifetime of the development.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my visit I saw that the appeal buildings were in use for storage. The appeal is therefore considered on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the appeal site provides a suitable location for the development having regard to the spatial strategy for the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the open countryside and seeks to use two former agricultural buildings for storage to support the appellants local business.
5. Policy DM8 of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (ADMDDPD) limits development in the countryside to specific forms, including rural diversification and employment uses.
6. Although the appellant has not demonstrated that there is a lack of alternative sites in more sustainable locations, Policy DM8 and the Framework do not require such an assessment. Whilst there is little substantive evidence regarding the existing business before me, the reuse of the agricultural buildings for storage supports rural diversification and the development has provided additional rural jobs.
7. The development reuses existing agricultural buildings, which have been refurbished, and supports farm diversification in a rural area. The reuse of the buildings does not therefore impact on the character of the rural area. The parking and HGV turning areas have been laid out and there is no clear evidence to suggest they are not sufficient to support the operation of the buildings as storage areas.
8. I conclude that the appeal site provides a suitable location for the development with regard to the Council's spatial strategy for the area. It conforms with Policy DM8 of the ADMDDPD and Policy SP3 of the Amended Core Strategy (2019), which together and amongst other matters seek to ensure development in the open countryside supports rural diversification, conversion of existing buildings and employment uses which demonstrate an ongoing contribution to local employment.

Other Matters

9. The Noise Assessment concluded that the level of noise created by the storage use including vehicles accessing and unloading would be similar to that expected from agricultural use of the buildings. From the evidence before me, I agree with the findings. As there are currently no time limits on the use of the buildings for agricultural use, the proposed condition limiting the hours of operation for the storage use would reduce any noise impacts for nearby occupiers.
10. I have had regard to the traffic survey information from Norwell & Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council and observed the narrow bridge referred to in the evidence. Although there may have been an increase in vehicles accessing the premises, there would have been traffic from the premises when in use as agricultural buildings. I also note that the Highway Authority did not have any substantive objections to the proposal and did not consider the development has a significant impact on highway capacity. The condition requiring the access road to be surfaced in a hard, bound material for a minimum distance of 20m behind the adopted highway boundary will limit any loose material or mud being transferred to the highway in the interests of highway safety. I do not therefore consider that the development has an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

11. The use of the other buildings in the vicinity of the development is not before me and I have not had regard to this matter in determining the appeal. Should the appellant wish to utilise the remaining agricultural buildings for storage, this would be subject to a further planning application and assessment of the impacts.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended the suggested conditions where appropriate.
13. As the development has taken place the standard time limit condition is not necessary. For certainty I have specified that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
14. The condition limiting the use of the premises to Class B8 storage is necessary due to the location in open countryside and the condition limiting the operation of the premises to specified times is necessary to protect the living conditions of nearby residents.
15. The conditions relating to the retention of the parking and turning areas and hard surfacing the access road are necessary in the interests of highway safety.
16. The Council also suggested a condition limiting the use of the premises to the appellant and his business. Paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that conditions should meet the tests and be kept to a minimum. The Planning Practice Guidance states that planning permission usually runs with the land and it is rarely appropriate to provide otherwise. With this in mind I do not consider that this proposed condition would be reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR