



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/W/25/3372773

The Stables, Town End Lane, Flintham NG23 5LT

- 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 & Mrs B Chiarella against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00283/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of a stable block to a dwelling and alterations to external elevations and the construction of a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On my visit I observed that development had commenced, with the first floor external walls partially constructed. I have, however, dealt with the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the location of the proposed development complies with the development plan; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Location

4. The appeal site comprises land occupied by a former stable block, set back from the road and situated alongside 30 mile per hour speed limit and village gateway signs. Except for a low-level building to the west, a farmhouse and associated agricultural buildings opposite to the north west and small stables to the east, the surrounding area is characterised by expanses of open fields bordered by hedgerows and trees. There are no footways or street lighting in the vicinity. Sporadic houses and buildings lie further to the west on the village approach after which the character changes. Buildings become denser and tightly knit, sited close to the footway. I therefore find that the site lies beyond the physical edge of Flintham village such that it is within the open countryside.

5. Policy 22 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (October 2019) (LPP) strictly controls new development within the open countryside which is to be conserved for the sake of its intrinsic beauty. An exception to this, within Policy 22 (2) (b) of the LPP, allows for the re-use and adaptation of buildings for appropriate uses, including housing, subject to the requirements of Policy 22 (3) of the LPP. The creation of a two-storey 5 bedroom dwelling, out of a low-level stable block that, based upon the extant permission (reference 20/01018/FUL) was only big enough for no more than a 3 bedroom single storey dwelling, goes above and beyond what could reasonably be considered to be an adaptation, by virtue of the sheer scale of the enlargement required.
6. Whilst Policy 22 (2) (d) of the LPP supports the extension and replacement of dwellings, as the building has not yet been converted, in planning terms this building still comprise stables such that this exception does not apply.
7. Although referred to by both main parties, there is no requirement within Policy 22 of the LPP for services and facilities to be accessible from residential conversions by sustainable modes of transport. Even if this was not the case, there is an extant permission for the residential conversion of the stable block (reference 20/01018/FUL) which demonstrates that the principle of such a change of use has already been established.
8. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal site would not accord with Policy 22 of the LPP which seeks to restrict development in the countryside to ensure that it may be enjoyed by all. Furthermore, it would therefore be contrary to Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (December 2014) (CS) which, amongst other matters, requires new development to accord with the development plan.

Character and Appearance

9. The surrounding area is characterised by large expanses of broadly level open fields bounded by hedgerows and trees, except for a farmhouse and associated agricultural buildings and some small-scale low-level buildings. The appeal site comprises a modest low-level stable building within an otherwise open parcel of land separated from the road by a mature hedgerow. It does not therefore interfere with the intrinsic character and beauty of the open verdant landscape.
10. The proposals introduce a first-floor level with pitched roof over and 2 storey central glazed section, dominating the existing low-level building and thus poorly integrating with it. The proposed development would be highly visible from various vantage points, despite the presence of an existing mature hedgerow to the front boundary, which is to be retained. The introduction of a 2-storey building in this location would therefore comprise an incongruous feature, having an urbanising effect on the locally distinctive verdant and open character of the surrounding landscape.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposals would have a harmful effect on the landscape character and would conflict with Policies 1 and 10 of the CS and Policy 22 of the LPP which require high quality design that conserves and complements the character and appearance of the area and integrates well with existing buildings.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that there are no concerns surrounding the proposal with regards to the quality of accommodation, design, impact on living conditions of existing and future occupiers, highway safety and that no objections were received from consultees or the public. The appeal site is also not located within the Green Belt. These are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of allowing the appeal.
13. The parties dispute the similarities between the extent of the site boundary on the previously approved scheme (20/01018/FUL) and the appeal site, and the resulting likely impact on character from the land becoming domesticated. They also dispute whether the appeal site is in an isolated location. However, these factors are not determinative in my decision making.
14. The appellant asserts that the development would boost the supply of homes enhancing the range of house types and tenures available in accordance with paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, no further details regarding local housing need or tenures are before me. In any event, given that there is an extant permission for the conversion of the existing building into a new dwelling, this is not considered to be determinative in my decision making.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed

K Mee

INSPECTOR