

Report to Planning Committee

Application Number: 2025/0517

Appeal Ref: 6001523

Site Address: Land at Kirkby Road, Ravenshead, Nottingham NG15 9HD

Application description: Erection of a detached dwelling

Case Officer: Amy Schofield

The planning application was refused permission on the 8th August 2025 for the reason outlined below:

1. The proposal is not considered to be a sustainable location and therefore is not considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt, under part c of section 155 of the NPPF. The proposal would be contrary to the NPPF and Policies ACS A, 2, 3 and 14 of the Gedling Borough Council Aligned Core Strategy (2014)

Application type

The application was a Permission in Principle (PIP) application, which is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The first stage (the PIP stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle, and the second stage (technical details consent) is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The scope of a PIP is limited to location, land use, and the amount of development permitted. All other matters are considered in stage two. This appeal relates to the first of these two stages.

Main Issue

The application site is an open area of land located within green belt, on the edge of Ravenshead.

The main issue in this appeal is whether the site is suitable for residential development, having particular regard to whether the site could be considered a sustainable location.

Development in the Green Belt is regarded as being inappropriate unless one of the exceptions listed in paragraphs 154 and 155 of the NPPF applies. In this case it was common ground that the site could be considered 'grey belt' and so, under para 155, development of homes in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where it meets all the criteria a-d.

It was common ground that the proposal does meet criteria a and b of 155, a) the proposed development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purpose of the remaining Green Belt across the plan area and b) there is a demonstrable unmet need for residential development, given the 5 year housing land supply shortage. Point d) regarding the 'Golden Rules' is not relevant to this kind of application.

The appeal centred around point c) - whether the proposal would be in a sustainable location.

The Inspector accepted the Council's evidence with regards to the unsustainable location of the application site, noting the following: proximity to only a very infrequent bus service; the distance to a more frequent bus service on Mansfield Road being 712m away but considered against the need to cross the 40mph road with no dedicated crossing, the speed of this road generally and the narrow and overgrown nature of the footway which would create a sub-optimal and unattractive walking environment; that the provision of street lights would not adequately mitigate the poor walking environment; the narrow and overgrown condition of the walkway would also prevent ready use of buggy or wheel chair access; and no substantive evidence provided for walking distance to other essential services (e.g. shops, schools, healthcare). The Inspector concluded that most everyday needs would not be met by public transport or on foot. The lack of dedicated provision for cycling and speed of the road was further cited as evidence that it would not offer genuine sustainable transport choices. The Inspector concluded future occupants would be heavily reliant on private vehicles for day to day trips.

Inspector Conclusions

- The site was not a sustainable location and so criterion c of para 155 of the NPPF was not met, meaning the development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- That the construction of one dwelling would result in built development where there is presently none and that the proposed residential use would alter the visual appearance of the site with the likely introduction of a driveway, garden area, and any associated domestic paraphernalia. Accordingly, the development would affect the openness of the Green Belt, both in spatial and visual terms, albeit to a limited degree.
- The proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green belt and would cause harm to its openness, therefore conflicting with the Local Plan and the NPPF.
- While acknowledging the modest benefits of a new house and short term benefits from jobs and supply chain in the construction phase, the Inspector concluded these did not clearly outweigh the harm identified and so the 'Very Special Circumstances' necessary to justify the application do not exist. This constitutes a strong reason for refusing the proposal.

Appeal dismissed.

Recommendation: To note the information.