

Planning Statement
& Heritage Impact Assessment

For

50 Main Street, Woodborough,
Nottinghamshire,
NG14 6EA

Demolition of home office and
erection of a dwelling

June 2023



Planning and Heritage Statement

50 Main Street, Woodborough, Nottinghamshire, NG14 6EA

Demolition of home office and erection of a dwelling

June 2023

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This planning and heritage statement has been prepared on behalf of Shaftesbury Design Practice in support of the planning application to demolish the existing home office and the erection of a dwelling.
- 1.2 This statement should be read in conjunction with the accompanying documents which include:
 - Plans and drawings
 - Application forms
- 1.3 This statement describes the application site and locality, comments on the design and access elements and assesses the proposal in terms of local and national policies.

2.0 Site and Surroundings

- 2.1 The site is located on the southern side of Main Street in Woodborough. It comprises an access onto the highway with the internal drive between 48 and 52 Main Street, leading to 50 Main Street. The host dwelling is a predominantly single storey structure with a two-storey element. The dwelling is set well into the site. There is hardstanding to the front of the dwelling for parking and turning with a large garden to the rear.
- 2.2 The existing home office is located to the rear of the dwelling and comprises a converted stable building. There are dwellings to the north, north-east and west with fields to the south.
- 2.3 The site is within the Woodborough conservation area and is situated within the Green Belt.

3.0 Relevant Planning History

- 3.1 Application 2022/1118 approved the change of use and conversion of the storage barn into a home office. This was conditionally approved with conditions specifying commencement of development, approved plans, preventing the laying of any hardstanding or paving and a condition to ensure the home office use remained ancillary to the use of Long Meadow Farm, 50 Main Street.

4.0 Proposed Development

- 4.1 The development is in full and comprises the removal of the existing outbuilding and the erection of a dwelling.
- 4.2 The proposed dwelling would be located on the site of the existing outbuilding and would comprise an approximately u-shaped building with two single storey projecting gables on the front (eastern) elevation with a recessed doorway in between. The northern elevation would comprise a gable with a

roof pitching away from the outer wall with hipped roofs to the southern and western elevations. A canopy is located on the western elevation.

- 4.3 The dwelling would accommodate an open plan kitchen, lounge and diner, utility and hall, two bedrooms, one en-suite and a bathroom. Garden would be provided around the dwelling with the existing native hedging remaining on the boundaries and use of timber post and railing fencing for other boundary treatment.
- 4.4 The existing vehicular access onto Main Street would be used to serve the proposed dwelling as well as continuing to serve the host dwelling. Parking and turning to serve the proposed dwelling would be provided within the grounds of the building.

5.0 Planning Policy

- 5.1 In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for this area comprises the Greater Nottingham Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan, adopted September 2014 and the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan, adopted July 2018.
- 5.2 The NPPF makes clear that applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and in this respect the NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.
- 5.3 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. There are three overarching objectives which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives. These are an economic objective, a social objective and an environmental objective. The economic objective seeks to ensure sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places at the right time to support growth. The social objective seeks to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by ensuring a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of the present and future generations and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment. The environmental objective seeks to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land.
- 5.4 So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of

particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

- 5.5 At paragraph 47 of the NPPF it states planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible, and within statutory timescales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicant in writing.
- 5.6 Section 12 seeks to achieve well-designed places. It states the creation of high-quality buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and creates better places in which to live. Planning decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and establish or maintain a strong sense of place using streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit. It also states permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 5.7 Section 13 covers Green Belt. At para. 138 it states Green Belt serves five purposes:
- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
 - e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 5.8 Para. 147 states inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. At para. 148 it states when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
- 5.9 At para. 149 states a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:
- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;

- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;
- e) limited infilling in villages;
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

5.10 The relevant policies of the Core Strategy are set out below:

- Policy A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy 3 The Green Belt
- Policy 8 Housing Size, Mix and Choice
- Policy 10 Design and Enhancing Local Identity
- Policy 11 The Historic Environment

5.11 The relevant policies of the LPD are set out below:

- Policy LPD12 Reuse of Buildings within the Green Belt
- Policy LPD15 Infill Development within the Green Belt
- Policy LPD26 Heritage Assets
- Policy LPD28 Conservation Areas
- Policy LPD32 Amenity
- Policy LPD 57 Parking Standards
- Policy LPD61 Highway Safety

6.0 Planning Assessment and Justification

6.1 In terms of the principle of development, the site forms part of the wider site accommodating 50 Main Street, Woodborough. As the site is located within the urban area there are no policy objections in principle to the development of the site for residential purposes. Issues of Green Belt, visual and residential amenity and highway safety are discussed below.

- 6.2 The NPPF sets out the national approach to development within the Green Belt. At 149 it states a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are, amongst other things d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.
- 6.3 The proposal relates to the erection of a dwelling and would replace a home office. In land use terms therefore the existing use is ancillary residential; the proposed use would be residential albeit the proposal would introduce an independent residential use.
- 6.4 At para. 138 the NPPF sets out the five purposes of land being within the Green Belt. The first is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. The proposal would replace an existing ancillary residential building and would not lead to urban sprawl. The second element is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. The proposal would develop a site accommodating an existing building and would not take development any closer to a neighbouring settlement. The third element is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. As set out above, the proposal would replace an existing building and would not encroach significantly into the countryside. The fourth element is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The site is within the conservation area; however, as set out below there would be no harm to the historic setting of the settlement. The final element is to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. This is not relevant to this application.
- 6.5 Therefore, the proposal would not be contrary to any of the five reasons for including land within a Green Belt designation.
- 6.6 The proposal comprises the replacement of an existing building within the Green Belt. Although not infill, the assessment in Policy LPD15 is relevant to assessing the impact of this proposal. This policy states the construction of new buildings in the designation is not inappropriate providing certain criteria are met.
- 6.7 The first is that the scale of the development is limited. The proposal relates to the erection of a modest bungalow and would be of a limited scale. The policy also seeks to ensure that development does not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the reasons for including land within it. The proposal would replace an existing building and although it would be larger than the existing building it would be of a modest scale and limited height and would not impact materially on the openness of the designation. The policy also seeks to ensure that the proposal does not affect valuable views into or out of the village or site. The proposal would not be contrary to this element. Finally, the policy states the proposal should be in keeping with the surrounding character in terms of height, bulk, form and general design. The proposal would not be out of keeping with the surrounding character visually. As such, the proposal would have a limited visual impact on the site and surroundings.

- 6.8 The site does not have a street frontage and is set back from the highway. As a result, the site is not prominent when viewed from the public realm. The site is well landscaped with hedgerows and trees and is therefore not easily open to public view. Although the site is slightly elevated above the host dwelling the proposed building would nestle amongst the existing landscaping. Further landscaping would take place using native species to further assimilate the development into the site and surroundings.
- 6.9 There is a mix of building sizes and styles in the locality. The proposed dwelling would not be out of keeping with the prevailing architecture.
- 6.10 In terms of residential amenity no harm has been identified. The proposed dwelling would meet national space requirements internally and adequate private amenity space could be provided. The dwelling would be set away from neighbouring properties and would not be overlooked or overshadowed by any adjacent building.
- 6.11 The proposal would not have any harmful impacts on the residential amenities of residents of neighbouring properties. Although the access would intensify in use, this increase would not be significant and no undue noise or disturbance would result. The dwelling would be set apart from neighbouring properties and would not result in any loss of privacy.
- 6.12 The existing access onto Main Street would be used. The geometry of the access is considered suitable to serve the proposed development given the limited amount of additional traffic likely to be generated. Hardstanding within the site would provide the required parking and turning to ensure all vehicles could enter and leave the site in a forward gear.
- 6.13 It is therefore considered that the proposed dwelling is acceptable in terms of the principle of development, Green Belt, visual amenity, residential amenity and highway safety. Should permission be granted, conditions limiting the extent of the residential curtilage and the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and outbuildings would be acceptable.

7.0 Heritage Assessment

- 7.1 The NPPF sets out the Government's approach to heritage. The relevant extracts are set out below.
- 7.2 Paragraph 194 states in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological

interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

- 7.3 Paragraph 195 states Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 7.4 Paragraph 196 states where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.
- 7.5 Paragraph 197 states in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
 - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
 - c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 7.6 Paragraph 198 states in considering any applications to remove or alter a historic statue, plaque, memorial or monument (whether listed or not), local planning authorities should have regard to the importance of their retention in situ and, where appropriate, of explaining their historic and social context rather than removal.
- 7.7 Paragraph 199 states when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
- 7.8 Paragraph 200 states any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:
- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
 - b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

- 7.9 Paragraph 201 states where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
- 7.10 Paragraph 202 states where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
- 7.11 Paragraph 203 states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
- 7.12 Paragraph 204 states local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.
- 7.13 Paragraph 205 states local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.
- 7.14 Paragraph 206 states local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.
- 7.15 Paragraph 207 states not all elements of a Conservation Area or World Heritage Site will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site should be treated either as substantial harm under paragraph 200 or less than substantial harm under

paragraph 201, as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area or World Heritage Site as a whole.

- 7.16 Paragraph 208 states local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.
- 7.17 The Local Planning Authority is required to ensure that special regard is given to preserving listed buildings and their settings in relation to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act').
- 7.18 The Local Planning Authority is also required to ensure that with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, through the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 at Section 72.
- 7.19 There are no listed buildings within the locality that would be affected by the proposed development.
- 7.20 The site is within the Woodborough conservation area.
- 7.21 The HER did not identify any additional heritage assets.
- 7.22 Pevsner did not refer to the site.
- 7.23 Therefore, the heritage assessment will focus on the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 7.24 The Woodborough Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the site as being within the Woodborough Hall Historic Landscape and Pastures Sub-Area. The appraisal highlights this area comprises largely undeveloped land with natural landscaping.
- 7.25 The proposal would be on the northern edge of this designation and would be more related to the built development to the north and west than the open spaces of the hall grounds. The building would replace an existing structure and would not occupy a prominent or dominant location. It would not be easily visible from the public realm and would be screened by the existing landscaping. This would be strengthened further by a proposed landscaping scheme comprising native species.
- 7.26 It is considered that the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area. The increase in the amount of built development would be modest, the building would be single storey with the massing effectively broken up by the difference elements of the building and the design would be sympathetic to the site and surroundings. As such, the

proposal would meet local and national policies, guidance and the above-mentioned Act.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 As set out above, the principle of the development can be supported as it represents a replacement building in the Green Belt in a sustainable settlement. The proposal would be visually acceptable, would not be harmful to the residential amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties and would provide a high standard of amenity for the future occupants of the dwelling proposed. The proposal would be served by a suitable access with parking and turning provided within the site. The development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 8.2 The proposal is therefore considered to meet local and national planning policies and the above Act.