



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3010/W/25/3365865

Land Off Town Street, Lound, Nottinghamshire DN22 8SA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Wood against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01016/OUT.
 - The development proposed is described as 'outline planning application for the change of use of land for the erection of a cattery and manager's lodge'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was made in outline with all matters reserved for future approval. I have therefore treated the submitted plans as illustrative.
3. The appellant now seeks a three-year temporary permission for a caravan-compliant unit on site, rather than the manager's lodge originally proposed during the application process. However, in the interests of fairness and precision, I have assessed the proposal as it was initially submitted to and considered by the Council, and as set out in the description of development for which permission was applied.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether the appeal site is an appropriate location for the proposed development with respect to local and national policy;
 - Whether the proposed dwelling is adequately justified having regard to local and national policy; and
 - The effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

Location

5. Policy ST8 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 adopted 2024 (LP) concerns rural economic growth and economic growth outside employment areas. It states that proposals for the growth of businesses in the rural area and outside employment sites/allocations will be supported where all its criteria are met. Point a) of this policy requires that there is a proven need for the development in terms of a business opportunity or operational requirements.

6. Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that planning decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads, and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.
7. I acknowledge the appellant's reasoning for proposing the development in this location. The appellant owns the land, which would support the financial viability of the business. The land within the blue boundary has been used by the family for keeping horses for several years, and the appellant is therefore familiar with the site and area. Additionally, the appellant has prior experience in the cattery business. It is contended that the location is ideal—close to several settlements yet sufficiently removed from neighbouring properties so as not to affect the living conditions of residents. The site itself is partly screened from public views, and the rural location would be beneficial for the business as it would provide least disturbance for the cats. The appellant also considers the size of the land appropriate for the proposed use, in contrast to alternative sites identified on Rightmove and through Fisher German, which were reportedly too large for the intended scale of the business.
8. With regard to the business itself, the proposed building would accommodate several cat pods and employ one full-time and one part-time staff member. The appellant also asserts that the proposed development, including the associated buildings, would enhance site security, particularly given concerns about rural crime.
9. While the appellant asserts that there is scope for a cattery business, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate a proven need for the development in terms of a business opportunity or operational requirements. Despite the submitted business plan, there is limited evidence that the proposal would meet a genuine market or economic demand. The submitted information also lacks substance with regard to suitable site alternatives, and it did not demonstrate that opportunities to make the location more sustainable have been exploited. Although rural crime may be a concern and the proximity to land used daily by the appellant's family may offer convenience, these factors do not establish that the proposal is essential to meet operational requirements in accordance with LP Policy ST8.
10. My attention has been drawn to a nearby rural business. However, I do not have full details of it, and the appellant has not demonstrated that the proposal before me is directly comparable with that business. In any event, I have considered the appeal scheme based on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.
11. Accordingly, it has not been demonstrated that the appeal site is an appropriate location for the proposed development, having regard to local and national policy. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with the aims of LP Policy ST8 and those of the Framework, as set out above.

Whether the proposed dwelling is adequately justified

12. The appellant refers to a chalet style dwelling as forming part of the proposal. LP Policy 32 supports new rural workers' dwellings in the countryside where specific criteria are met. LP Policies ST1 and ST2 set out Bassetlaw's Spatial Strategy, including the approach to housing growth in rural areas and the criteria for residential development in the countryside.
13. The appellant acknowledges that the proposal does not meet the criteria of LP Policy 32, and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate compliance with the objectives of LP Policies ST1 and ST2. Nonetheless, it is argued that the proposed manager's accommodation is necessary to ensure the care, welfare, and security of the cats. Although the application is in outline form and the plans are illustrative, the appellant contends that the proposed size of the lodge is justified to accommodate their family.
14. Given my findings in the section above in relation to the inappropriateness of the development, and the failure of the proposal to comply with the requirements of the aforementioned policies, I find that the proposed dwelling is not adequately justified. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the aims of LP Policies 32, ST1 and ST2 as set out above. The proposal is also contrary to the aims of the Framework, particularly paragraph 84, which seeks to avoid isolated homes in the countryside unless justified by specific circumstances.

Highway safety

15. The appeal site would be accessed via a track off Town Street. Currently, hedgerows on both sides of the access track, including at the junction with Town Street, restrict visibility. Variations in land levels along Town Street and adjacent to the junction further compromise visibility.
16. The submitted Transport Note dated July 2024 (TN) suggests that the required visibility splays could be achieved if the hedgerows at the junction are trimmed back. However, the extent of trimming required is unclear, and the submitted plans do not confirm whether the appellant owns or controls these hedgerows. As such, it has not been demonstrated that the required visibility splays could be achieved as to secure safe access to the appeal site. The TN also acknowledges that the undulating topography of Town Street affects visibility in the vertical plane, particularly to the north of the access.
17. The existing access does not support two-way vehicle movements at the junction with Town Street. While two passing places are proposed along the access track, these would not resolve the issue at the junction itself, potentially resulting in vehicles waiting on Town Street to enter or exit the site. The appellant states that the agricultural field currently generates four two-way vehicle movements per day and suggests that the proposed development would generate similar levels of traffic. However, it is unclear whether the access would continue to serve the stables in addition to the proposed development, which would also include new residential accommodation in the form of the manager's lodge. Furthermore, while the appellant intends to offer a door-to-door service for clients, the evidence indicates that cat owners may also visit the site by appointment. This uncertainty regarding the overall vehicle movements adds to concerns about the suitability of the access, particularly at the junction with Town Street.

18. It is argued that the access has been used for over 30 years by vehicles of various size, and the appellant's family are familiar with the highway network and the access arrangement. The submitted evidence indicates low traffic flows on Town Street and no recorded accidents in the vicinity of the site over a 20-year period. Be that as it may, these do not negate the need for the development to achieve safe access with adequate visibility. Whilst the proposed scheme could also incorporate a traffic signing scheme, I am not persuaded that this would be sufficient to address the visibility concerns and to ensure safe access for all users.
19. The appellant asserts that the proposed access is comparable to other farm accessways in the area. However, no detailed evidence has been provided to support this claim. Nevertheless, I have assessed the appeal development based on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.
20. In conclusion, the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety. Thus, it is contrary to the aims of LP Policy ST53, which requires, amongst other things, that developments provide well-designed, safe and convenient access for all. The proposal also conflicts with paragraph 115 of the Framework, which requires safe and suitable access to the site for all users.

Other Matters

21. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. I acknowledge the proposal would be particularly beneficial for the appellant's daughter, as it would allow her to follow her passion and gain financial independence. However, I have no convincing evidence before me that the appeal scheme is the only way through which the objectives of the appellant's daughter can be achieved. I consider this particularly important in the context of the harm that I have identified. Accordingly, for these reasons it does not follow from the PSED that the appeal should succeed.
22. The appellant has drawn my attention to the Framework's objectives in achieving sustainable development. However, given my findings above, the proposal fails to achieve the aims of the Framework. I have also had regard to the support letters from third parties. However, they do not alter my findings above with regard to the identified harm.
23. The Planning Officer's report found that the proposal would not respect the openness of the countryside and therefore would conflict with LP Policy ST33. However, this matter was not cited in the Council's Decision Notice as a reason for refusal and has not been addressed by either party during the appeal process. In light of my findings on the main issues, I did not consider it necessary to seek further comments from the main parties regarding the matter of visual amenity.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

INSPECTOR