

The Planning Inspectorate

QUESTIONNAIRE ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT OR DISCONTINUANCE NOTICE APPEAL (Online Version)

You must ensure that a copy of the completed questionnaire, together with any attachments, are sent to the appellant/agent by the date given in the start letter.

Appeal Reference	APP/W3005/Z/25/3375193
Appeal By	M&M'S DESSERTS LTD
Site Address	131 Outram Street SUTTON-IN-ASHFIELD Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG Grid Ref Easting: 449926.0 Grid Ref Northing: 359420.0

PART 1

- i) Refusal of consent for the display of the advertisement(s)
- ii) Grant of consent for the display of the advertisement(s)
- iii) Failure of the LPA to give notice of its decision within the appropriate period of an application for consent
- iv) Service of a Discontinuance Notice

Warning: The written representations procedure is an expedited procedure for appeals against refusal of consent for the display of advertisements.

1.b. Do you agree that the written representations procedure is appropriate for this appeal? Please note there must be exceptional reasons for us to agree to a procedure other than the written representations procedure. If your answer is no, please give your reasons below.

	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

2.a. Can the relevant part of the appeal site be seen from a road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land?

	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

2.b. Is it essential for the Inspector to enter the site to assess the impact of the proposal?

	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

2.c. Are there any known health and safety issues that would affect the conduct of the site inspection?

	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

3. Did you notify people about the application? Yes No

Please attach any representations received

[see 'Questionnaire Documents' section](#)

PART 2

4. Is one of your grounds for refusal 'Public Safety' involving highway or traffic considerations? Yes No

- 5.a. Have you notified anyone about the appeal? Yes No
Please attach
- 5.b. A copy of the letter with which you notified people about the appeal.
 see 'Questionnaire Documents' section
- 5.c. A list of the people you notified.
 see 'Questionnaire Documents' section
- 6.a. Are there any other appeals or matters relating to the same site still being considered by us or the Secretary of State? Yes No
- 6.b. Are there any other appeals or matters adjacent or close to the site still to be considered by us or the Secretary of State? Yes No

PART 3

- 7.a. Is the site in a Conservation Area? Yes No
- 7.b. Is the site adjacent to a Conservation Area? Yes No
8. Is the site in an Area of Special Control of Advertisements? Yes No
9. Is the appeal site within:
- a. A Green Belt? Yes No
- b. An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty? Yes No
- 10.a. Is the appeal site in or adjacent to, or likely to affect, an SSSI and/or an internationally designated site (i.e cSAC, SAC, pSPA, SPA, Ramsar)? Yes No
- 10.b. Are any protected species likely to be affected by the proposals? Yes No
- 11.a. Would the proposed advertisement affect the setting of a listed building? Yes No
- 12.a. Would the proposed advertisement affect an Ancient Monument (whether scheduled or not)? Yes No
13. Do you consider that any condition other than the five standard conditions set out in Schedule 2 of the 2007 Regulations should be imposed in the event that express consent as applied for is granted? Yes No

Please provide full detail of your suggested condition(s) and the reason why you regard the condition(s) to be necessary.

The intensity of illumination of the sign(s) shall not exceed XXX candelas/square metre.
Reason: To ensure that the display does not appear as an unduly prominent feature in the area.

PART 4

Copies of the following must be attached to this form:

- 15.a. If the appellant has submitted photographs and a plan with their appeal documents please confirm you are content these are a complete and accurate representation. Yes No
- 15.b. Please provide one set of photographs of the appeal site and its surroundings along with a plan showing the location of the appeal site and the positions from which the photographs have been taken. The photographs should be of good quality and in colour.
 see 'Questionnaire Documents' section

Copies of the following documents must, if appropriate, be attached to this form:

16.a. the planning officer's report to committee or delegated report on the application and any other relevant documents/minutes;

see 'Questionnaire Documents' section

16.b. extracts from any relevant statutory development plan policies (even if you intend to rely more heavily on the emerging plan). You must include the front page, the title and date of approval/adoption, please give the status of the plan. Copies of the policies should include the relevant supporting text. You must provide this even if the appeal is against non-determination;

List of policies:

ST1, ST2, ST4

see 'Questionnaire Documents' section

see 'Questionnaire Documents' section

16.c. extracts of any relevant policies which have been 'saved' by way of a Direction.

16.d. Extracts from any supplementary document that you consider necessary, together with the date of its adoption. In the case of emerging documents, please state what stage they have reached.

16.e. if any Development Plan Document (DPD) or Neighbourhood Plan relevant to this appeal has been examined and found sound/met the basic conditions and passed a referendum, the date the DPD or Neighbourhood Plan is likely to be adopted and, if you consider this date will be before the Inspector's decision on this appeal is issued, an explanation of the Council's policy position in respect of this appeal upon its adoption. You should also include an explanation of the status of existing policies and plans, as they relate to this appeal, upon adoption and which (if any) will be superseded;

16.f. if any DPD or Neighbourhood Plan relevant to this appeal has been submitted for examination, or in the case of a Neighbourhood Plan has been examined and is awaiting a referendum, an explanation of any substantive changes in the progress of the emerging plan, and their relevance to this appeal if it is considered that the plan will not be adopted before the Inspector's decision on this appeal is issued;

16.g. your Authority's CIL charging schedule is being/has been examined;

16.h. your Authority's CIL charging schedule has been/is likely to be adopted.

16.i. Any other relevant information or correspondence you consider we should know about;

16.j. A true copy of the Discontinuance Notice.

17. If this appeal is not following the written representations expedited procedure do you intend to send a further statement about this appeal?

18. Do you wish to attach your statement of case?

LPA Details

I certify that a copy of this appeal questionnaire and any enclosures will be sent to the appellant or agent today.

LPA's reference

Completed by

On behalf of

Please provide the details of the officer we can contact for this appeal, if different from the Planning Inspectorate's usual contact for this type of appeal.

Name

James Carr

Phone no (including dialling code)

01623457388

Email

james.carr@ashfield.gov.uk

Please advise the case officer of any changes in circumstances occurring after the return of the questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE DOCUMENTS

Appeal Reference APP/W3005/Z/25/3375193

Appeal By M&M'S DESSERTS LTD

Site Address
131 Outram Street
SUTTON-IN-ASHFIELD
Nottinghamshire
NG17 4BG
Grid Ref Easting: 449926.0
Grid Ref Northing: 359420.0

The documents listed below were uploaded with this questionnaire form:

Relates to Section: PART 1
Document Description: 3. Notification response.
File name: Highways Comments.pdf

Relates to Section: PART 2
Document Description: 5.b. A copy of the letter with which you notified people about the appeal.
File name: APPEAL COMMERCIAL APPEALS SERVICE - RESIDENTS.pdf

Relates to Section: PART 2
Document Description: 5.c. A list of the people you notified.
File name: Consultees.docx

Relates to Section: PART 4
Document Description: 14.b. One set of photographs of the appeal site and its surroundings along with a plan showing the location of the appeal site and the positions from which the photographs have been taken.
File name: Not Sent Plans or photographs.docx

Relates to Section: PART 4
Document Description: 15.a. The planning officer's report to committee or delegated report on the application and any other relevant documents/minutes.
File name: Delegated Report 0502.pdf

Relates to Section: PART 4
Document Description: 16.b. Extracts from any relevant statutory development plan policies.
File name: Title and Front Page.pdf

Relates to Section: PART 4
Document Description: 16.b. Extracts from any relevant statutory development plan policies.
File name: ST1.pdf
File name: ST4.pdf
File name: ST2.pdf

The documents listed below were already attached elsewhere with this questionnaire form:

Completed by Not Set

Date 06/11/2025 12:23:27

Inspector: Eloise Molyneux
Planning 0303 444 5000
Inspectorate
Contact Number:
Planning NORTH3@planning
Inspectorate E inspectorate.gov.uk
Mail:

Our Ref: APP/W3005/Z/25/337519
3
Date: 06 November 2025

Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007

Dear Sir/Madam

APP. NO: V/2025/0502
APPEAL REF: APP/W3005/Z/25/3375193
SITE: 131
Outram Street
Sutton in Ashfield
Nottinghamshire
NG17 4BG

I refer to the above planning application which was recently considered by the Council. The applicant has now decided to appeal against this decision. The Planning Inspectorate has asked that the appeal be decided by way of the Commercial Appeals Services.

As you were informed or commented on the planning application I am informing you of the applicant's decision to appeal. The Commercial Appeals Service does not offer an opportunity for interested parties to comment at the appeal stage. However, any representations you may have made regarding the original planning application will be forwarded to the Inspector and the Inspector will take full account of these representations when deciding the appeal.

If you wish to withdraw your comments you must write immediately the Inspector include the appeal reference quoted and send to the Planning Inspectorate, , Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6PN. Your comments will be disclosed to the appeal parties. If you wish to receive a copy of the Inspector's appeal decision letter then you must request one in writing to the Planning Inspectorate.

Address: Council Offices, Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham. NG17 8DA
Tel: 01623 450000 **Fax:** 01623 457585
www.ashfield.gov.uk

If reasonable adjustments are needed to fully engage with the Authority - contact **01623 450000**



DISTRICT COUNCIL

The appeal documents can be viewed at the Ashfield District Council website. The progress of this appeal can be tracked via GOV.UK www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate. The Inspectorate may publish details of your comments on the internet.

Yours Sincerely
Christine Sarris
Assistant Director Planning

Address: Council Offices, Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham. NG17 8DA

Tel: 01623 450000 **Fax:** 01623 457585

www.ashfield.gov.uk

If reasonable adjustments are needed to fully engage with the Authority - contact **01623 450000**

Consultatees

	The Owner / Occupier	1 Downing Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4EF			
	The Owner / Occupier	129 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	129a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	129b Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	131a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	133 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	133a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			

	The Owner / Occupier	133b Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	133c Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	136 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4FT			
	The Owner / Occupier	136a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4FT			
	The Owner / Occupier	136b Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4FT			
	The Owner / Occupier	Flat 1b 131 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Flat 1c 131 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			

	The Owner / Occupier	Flat 2a 131 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Flat 2b 131 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Flats 1 To 4 131 Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Room 1 131a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Room 2 131a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Room 3 131a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Room 4 131a Outram Street			

		Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	The Owner / Occupier	Room 5 131a Outram Street Sutton In Ashfield Nottinghamshire NG17 4BG			
	Nottinghamshire County Council - Highways	Highways North Communities Department Darwin Drive Sherwood Energy Village Ollerton Notts NG22 9FF	Hdc.ashfield@nottscc.gov.uk	Email	

Delegated Report

Application Number: V/2025/0502

Address: 131 Outram Street, Sutton in Ashfield, Nottinghamshire, NG17 4BG

Description of Works: Application for Consent to Display Advertisement - Illuminated Fascia Sign

The Application	Application for Consent to Display Advertisement - Illuminated Fascia Sign
Policy Considerations	<p>Ashfield Local Plan Review (ALPR) (2002)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ST1 – Development• ST2 – Main Urban Area• SH4 – Local Shopping Centre <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2024)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Part 7 – Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres• Part 12 – Achieving Well-Designed Places
Relevant Planning History	None
Summary of comments received	<p>NCC Highways: no objection subject to a condition relating to controlling the level of illumination.</p> <p>No other written representations have been received in respect of this application.</p>
Comments on above	See main body of the report.
Summary	<p>The Site and Application:</p> <p>The application site consists of a ground floor commercial premises located on Outram Street, Sutton-In-Ashfield, which is a designated local shopping centre as outlined within the ALPR (2002).</p> <p>The application seeks advertisement consent for an illuminated fascia sign. The sign measures 5.8 metres by 0.97 metres, the illumination is contained within the 3D lettering only and is internally illuminated and will be static. The application form and plans state the illumination at 5002 lumens; this calculates to approximately 400 candelas per square metre (cd/m²).</p> <p>The signage will advertise a dessert shop; the main fascia board is blue with the 3D lettering and logo in white.</p> <p>Visual & Amenity:</p>

Paragraph 135(a) of the NPPF (2024) sets out that development should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. In addition, Paragraph 141 states that the quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed.

The existing shopfront architecture has a wooden fascia that is angled downwards. Upon reviewing the history of the site, all fascia signage has been contained and angled within the existing shopfront fascia. The only deviation from this is between August 2024-25, in which the business has a similar signage layout to what is proposed with this application, this signage did not benefit from advert consent.

The proposed signage is a fascia board which projects significantly further forward than the existing shopfront fascia and is an attempt to cover up the existing architecture rather than utilising the existing shopfront features, when viewed from the side, there would also be a clear visual gap between the signage and the shopfront of the fascia. The applicant was made aware of the concern with the design of the signage and suggested that the signage be contained within the existing shopfront fascia, the applicant declined to amend any details, as such the application is being considered on the existing submitted plans.

The layout of the proposed signage is a lazy design attempt which does not consider the existing shopfront architecture and would protrude significantly from the existing shopfront fascia. The result would be an obvious and incongruous addition of signage within the street scene, to the detriment of visual amenity.

The guidance produced by the institute of lighting engineers outlines that for signage up to 10m² within a neighbourhood centre, the level of illumination should not exceed 800 cd/m², the signage is significantly under the maximum set out within the guidance; therefore, it is considered its illumination would not have a significant impact upon visual amenity.

There are a number of residential properties in the area, however the site is within a local shopping centre and considering the size, location and illumination level of the signage, it is considered it would not have a detrimental impact upon residential amenity.

Highways:

The highways department at Nottinghamshire County Council have been consulted as part of the application process, who raised no objection subject to the inclusion of a condition controlling the level of illumination.

If a favourable decision is reached, it is considered reasonable to condition the level of illumination as so to control the unrestricted increase in illumination from the signage, in the interests of motorists and residential properties in the vicinity.

Conclusion:

Having reviewed all the submitted information and assessing this against all relevant policies and material planning considerations, refusal is recommended for this application.

Recommendation	Refuse consent
----------------	----------------

Reason Code	Text	Monitor
	The proposed fascia signage would be an obvious and incongruent addition to the building that does not respect the existing shopfront architecture, to the detriment of visual amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to ST1 of the ALPR (2002) and Part 12 of the NPPF (2024).	

	Signed	Dated
Case Officer		27/10/2025
Development Team Manager		27/10/2025
Determined by Service Director Or on their behalf		27/10/2025

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT

HIGHWAY REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT:	Ashfield	Date Received	05/09/2025
OFFICER:	James Carr		
PROPOSAL:	Application for consent to display an advertisement - illuminated fascia signage	D.C. No.	V/2025/0502
LOCATION:	131 Outram Street, Sutton In Ashfield, Nottinghamshire, NG17 4BG		
APPLICANT:	Mason Canlin		

This application is for permission to display an illuminated fascia signing on 131 Outram street Sutton in Ashfield.

The Highways Authority would have no objection to the development as proposed subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

The maximum night-time luminance shall not exceed [300cdm-2 / 600cdm-2 (>10sq.m / <10sq.m respectively)] and shall never exceed 5,000cdm-2, the rate of change of image shall be a minimum of 5 seconds, and there shall be no moving images.

Reason: To minimise the distraction to motorists in the interest of highway safety.

We can see from the application form submitted that plans have been uploaded with the appeal however we have not received a copy, nor can we access anything on the planning inspectorate's website so cannot comment if they are accurate.



Ashfield Local Plan Review

Adopted November 2002

ASHFIELD LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

ADOPTED NOVEMBER 2002

FOREWORD

The previous Ashfield Local Plan was adopted in December 1995 with a plan period to 2001. Following adoption of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review in November 1996 work commenced on the Ashfield Local Plan Review with a plan period to 2011.

In July 1997 consultation took place on the Main Issues and Site Allocations Report. The Council's response to comments made on the report were subsequently published on 4th March 1999 together with the Ashfield Local Plan Review Deposit Draft.

Following detailed consideration of responses to the Deposit Draft Plan and revised Government guidance, a Second Deposit Local Plan was prepared to include proposed changes to the Deposit Draft Local Plan. The Second Deposit Local Plan was subsequently approved on 11th May 2000 for public consultation.

An Inquiry into unresolved objections to the Ashfield Local Plan Review was held between 13th February and 22nd May 2001. The Inspector considered all of the outstanding objections to the Plan together with a number of informal 'Inquiry Changes' (IC's) that the Council proposed at the time of the Inquiry.

The Inspector's Report on the Local Plan Inquiry was released for public consideration on 16th January 2002. The Council considered all of the Inspector's recommendations, and subsequently the 'Statement of Decisions on the Inspector's Report & Proposed Modifications to the Ashfield Local Plan Review' was published for consultation on 9th May 2002. A report of consultation was published in July 2002 indicating that no further material changes were required to the plan.

The Council resolved on 5th September 2002, to formally adopt the Local Plan in its modified form. The Council publicly advertised its decision to adopt the Plan, on the 22nd November 2002.



Mr. P.K. Johnson, Dip T.P., M.R.T.P.I.
Head of Development Services,
Ashfield District Council,
Council Offices,
Urban Road,
Kirkby-in-Ashfield,
Nottingham,
East Midlands,
NG17 8DA

DEVELOPMENT

POLICY ST1 DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE:-

- a) IT WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH OTHER POLICIES IN THIS LOCAL PLAN,**
- b) IT WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE CHARACTER, QUALITY, AMENITY OR SAFETY OF THE ENVIRONMENT,**
- c) IT WILL NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT HIGHWAY SAFETY, OR THE CAPACITY OF THE TRANSPORT SYSTEM,**
- d) IT WILL NOT PREJUDICE THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF AN AREA,**
- e) IT WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH AN ADJOINING OR NEARBY LAND USE.**

- 2.28 Government advice states that in general the planning system operates on the principle that planning permission should be granted unless the development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance, and those who decide planning applications and appeals must give clear and well founded reasons for refusing planning permission. Policy ST1 represents the general policy against which all development proposals will be assessed irrespective of land use. It outlines the basic criteria which all development proposals must satisfy and therefore applies to all the land use based policies in the Plan. Hence, development proposals must accord with the land use policies contained within the Local Plan Review if they are to gain the support of the Authority.
- 2.29 A development must not adversely affect the character, quality, amenity or safety of the built or natural environment, wherever it occurs. This will include the need to protect open spaces and playing fields in urban areas and elsewhere. The appearance of a proposed development and its relationship with its surroundings are material considerations in determining planning applications and the Authority will not accept any development which adversely affects the local environment. Where possible the Council will promote good quality design solutions which respect and enhance the local character of an area. Design solutions which provide a safer and more secure environment to assist with planning out crime and which incorporate energy efficient layouts will be encouraged. This consideration will apply equally to all forms of development, involving both built development and changes of use of buildings.
- 2.30 The landscape treatment of the site should be one of the main considerations in any development proposal. Developers should take into account the landscape characteristics of the area, significant landscape features of the site and the potential of the site to contribute to the character and appearance of the area. Sympathetic and effective boundary treatment together with good quality landscaping can improve the setting and appearance of new developments and make them more acceptable. This should include the retention of valuable existing features and habitats, wherever possible, and the use of native and other complementary species.
- 2.31 All developments must have a safe means of access which is adequate to serve the proposal and does not adversely affect pedestrian or vehicular safety. The capacity of the transport system to take new development will also be considered. It is therefore likely that transport impact assessments will be required for major proposals and developers should consider undertaking such a study in advance of the submission of a planning application in order to facilitate its full and proper consideration. In a wider context the likelihood of larger developments affecting the capacity of motorway junctions will be considered by the Highways Agency. In addition, appropriate car parking facilities must be provided which are well related to the development and are laid out in a usable form. The Council's agreed car parking standards are contained in Appendix 7.
- 2.32 Some developments, due to the relationship between the site and adjacent land, may prove to be unacceptable as their implementation in isolation could adversely affect the more comprehensive development of an area of land at a later date. In such circumstances developers will be encouraged to contact adjacent land owners to seek a comprehensive solution.
- 2.33 Some developments which are acceptable in one location may be unacceptable in another due to possible conflicts with adjacent or nearby land uses. This may include such issues as diverse

as a new lighting scheme which may result in glare or light spillage beyond the site, for example the floodlighting of a sports facility adjacent to residential properties. New industrial uses may also be unacceptable close to residential areas or existing uses may generate noise, smells, vibrations etc. which render nearby sites unsuitable for other uses.

GENERAL LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

- 2.34 The principal aims and objectives established in the adopted Local Plan still remain essential to the Local Plan Review. With increasing requirements for development land it is important that the main strategic approach of the plan is retained. It is however recognised that in some cases the release of development land in both the Green Belt and other areas of countryside will be required and it is necessary to consider a method of identifying the most appropriate way of determining the suitability of such sites.
- 2.35 In general terms therefore the review has adopted a "sequential" approach to site identification in accordance with PPG3. This is based on Structure Plan Review policy of identifying land within urban areas as a priority, followed by sites adjoining urban areas, and finally, only when the first two options have been exhausted, to consider sites elsewhere.
- 2.36 In considering the release of sites for development which are currently within the Green Belt or other countryside, the Council will wish to ensure that those sites which have the minimum impact on the general purposes of Green Belt and Countryside are the preferred sites. In this respect, each site considered has been tested against these purposes. Sites will be preferred where the loss of a Green Belt area or other countryside can be minimised or "contained" within firm and defensible boundaries and where this is unlikely to lead to further loss of land to development in the future. In the case of sites in Hucknall, the need to maintain the open break with Nottingham City is of paramount importance.

White Land

- 2.37 The Structure Plan Review places no requirement on Districts to identify land for development needs beyond 2011. The consideration of development needs to 2011 has involved a review of Green Belt to identify firm defensible boundaries once account has been taken of land requirements to 2011. The Structure Plan advises that where such defensible Green Belt boundaries exist beyond a line necessary to meet 2011 land requirements then the remaining areas should be identified as white land and safeguarded for future development needs. There is currently no Regional Planning Guidance to determine development needs beyond 2011.
- 2.38 The Council is concerned to ensure that the development needs of the South Nottinghamshire Sub-Area beyond 2011 are considered as a whole. In allocating all land beyond existing urban area boundaries which is necessary to meet Structure Plan requirements to 2011, the Council has undertaken, where appropriate, a review of Green Belt. Green Belt boundaries have been established which follow firm and defensible features and which in all cases do not identify land beyond that which would be required to meet needs to 2011. Consequently it has not been necessary to identify white land within this Local Plan Review. Land within the reviewed Green Belt should remain so until land needs beyond 2011 have been properly identified in the context of all land requirements across all relevant Structure Plan Sub Areas. The Council considers this approach, which could lead to a subsequent Green Belt Review, preferable to the premature identification of white land against uncertain future land requirements.

Public Transport Corridors

- 2.39 In the South Nottinghamshire Sub-Area the Structure Plan Review identifies a series of Public Transport Corridors along which development should be concentrated. The identification of such corridors is based on the principles of sustainable development and the objectives of PPG13 which encourages travel by public transport to reduce the use of the private car. This will in turn reduce fuel consumption and congestion on the roads by making the most efficient use of transport facilities in relation to land use.
- 2.40 In Ashfield, the Nottingham to Hucknall corridor is identified in Structure Plan Review Policy 1/2.

The corridor is centred on public transport facilities currently provided by rail (The Robin Hood Line) and by line 1 of the Nottingham Express Transit System (NET). This is because rail-based facilities are more efficient than road-based facilities in terms of the numbers of people they can transport to and from the City Centre, particularly during busy periods. The NET system when operational will be a high frequency, high capacity system capable of transporting up to 1,200 people per hour from Hucknall to Nottingham at peak times.

- 2.41 In identifying development sites within the Hucknall area a significant criteria has therefore been the accessibility of land to either a Robin Hood Line Station or a proposed NET stop. Sites which are within 1km of such a facility are preferred since this reflects a reasonable maximum distance for walking to a station. Beyond this distance, sites which are well served by main bus routes, preferably linking to a railway station, will be considered. Sites which cannot meet these criteria have only been considered as a last resort where there is the potential to improve public transport facilities in the future. Such improvements are most likely to be bus based.
- 2.42 The Authority has also considered the potential of larger sites to justify new rail or NET facilities in the future. However, it is unlikely that a new Robin Hood Line station could be provided since there are capacity constraints on the line caused by a long single track section and there are already sufficient station sites at appropriate locations for a successful heavy rail operation. Proposals for new housing and employment development to the north of Hucknall are currently being considered as part of the Gedling Local Plan Review process. Whilst the outcome of this process is not currently finalised, a safeguarded route has been identified between Hucknall Station and the boundary with Gedling Borough to the north. This will allow for a potential extension of the NET system, should this be required in the future, to widen transport choices in this area.
- 2.43 The principles of accessibility to public transport facilities have also been considered in relation to sites in the West Nottinghamshire Sub-Area. While no Public Transport Corridor is identified, parts of the area are served by the Robin Hood Line, particularly in Kirkby, and therefore sites can be considered in the same way as South Nottinghamshire sites. Considerations of accessibility also include the need to identify sites within walking distance of existing bus routes and with good cycle access.

Urban Capacity

- 2.44 In meeting the aims of the plan in relation to concentration of development within urban areas, and in support of the objectives of sustainability, an exercise has therefore been undertaken within all urban areas of the District to identify potential development sites. This has involved a detailed investigation of all undeveloped sites and open areas including allotments, open space, derelict sites and vacant sites and buildings. The details of the exercise are contained in Technical Paper No.1: 'Urban Capacity'. Some of the sites identified in the Local Plan Review have arisen from this Urban Capacity exercise and others, mainly smaller sites under 0.4 hectares may come forward for development during the plan period.
- 2.45 While indicating that some development land clearly exists within the existing urban area, the study also shows that overall needs for both housing and employment land will need to encroach into open countryside, which in the southern part of the District will involve loss of Green Belt. Accordingly sites which have been identified for development adjoining the urban area have been carefully selected in accordance with the "sequential" approach referred to in paragraph 2.35 and 2.36 to ensure the minimum of impact on the open countryside and to ensure the purposes of Green Belt are not undermined.



Ashfield Local Plan Review

Adopted November 2002

ASHFIELD LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

ADOPTED NOVEMBER 2002

FOREWORD

The previous Ashfield Local Plan was adopted in December 1995 with a plan period to 2001. Following adoption of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review in November 1996 work commenced on the Ashfield Local Plan Review with a plan period to 2011.

In July 1997 consultation took place on the Main Issues and Site Allocations Report. The Council's response to comments made on the report were subsequently published on 4th March 1999 together with the Ashfield Local Plan Review Deposit Draft.

Following detailed consideration of responses to the Deposit Draft Plan and revised Government guidance, a Second Deposit Local Plan was prepared to include proposed changes to the Deposit Draft Local Plan. The Second Deposit Local Plan was subsequently approved on 11th May 2000 for public consultation.

An Inquiry into unresolved objections to the Ashfield Local Plan Review was held between 13th February and 22nd May 2001. The Inspector considered all of the outstanding objections to the Plan together with a number of informal 'Inquiry Changes' (IC's) that the Council proposed at the time of the Inquiry.

The Inspector's Report on the Local Plan Inquiry was released for public consideration on 16th January 2002. The Council considered all of the Inspector's recommendations, and subsequently the 'Statement of Decisions on the Inspector's Report & Proposed Modifications to the Ashfield Local Plan Review' was published for consultation on 9th May 2002. A report of consultation was published in July 2002 indicating that no further material changes were required to the plan.

The Council resolved on 5th September 2002, to formally adopt the Local Plan in its modified form. The Council publicly advertised its decision to adopt the Plan, on the 22nd November 2002.



Mr. P.K. Johnson, Dip T.P., M.R.T.P.I.
Head of Development Services,
Ashfield District Council,
Council Offices,
Urban Road,
Kirkby-in-Ashfield,
Nottingham,
East Midlands,
NG17 8DA

MAIN URBAN AREAS

POLICY ST2 DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONCENTRATED WITHIN THE MAIN URBAN AREAS OF HUCKNALL, KIRKBY-IN-ASHFIELD AND SUTTON-IN-ASHFIELD AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP.

- 2.46 Most of the specific land use allocations in subsequent chapters are concentrated in these three Main Urban Areas. In addition, it is proposed that, in general, other proposals which emerge during the Plan period and do not conflict with specific land use designations or with development control criteria will be encouraged in these areas where services are concentrated and access to facilities is best.
- 2.47 As indicated in para. 2.26, it is anticipated that the general role of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield as the main employment, housing and service centres in the District will remain largely unchanged in coming years, as will the positive attitude of the District Council to development in these areas. As a result, policy ST2 does not distinguish between the three towns in terms of the overall strategic attitude to development, but looks to concentrate new development in each of them during the Plan period.
- 2.48 The Structure Plan Review proposes the concentration of new development within and adjoining existing urban areas, and in the case of Hucknall along identified 'Public Transport Corridors'. The scale of additional development needs to 2011 has meant that capacity of the Main Urban Areas identified within the adopted Ashfield Local Plan is insufficient to provide for all new requirements.
- 2.49 The precise boundaries of the Main Urban Areas have therefore been redrawn to reflect both existing and proposed development, and are shown on the Proposals Map. Wherever possible, previously established boundaries have been retained. Where encroachment onto land previously identified as Green Belt or other Countryside is proposed, boundaries have been drawn to minimise further loss of countryside using identifiable strong boundaries wherever possible. Hence the policy wording makes no further provision for developments 'adjoining' these urban areas. Other developments on the edge of the identified Main Urban Areas will be unacceptable unless they conform with Green Belt or Countryside policies (EV1 and EV2).



Ashfield Local Plan Review

Adopted November 2002

ASHFIELD LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

ADOPTED NOVEMBER 2002

FOREWORD

The previous Ashfield Local Plan was adopted in December 1995 with a plan period to 2001. Following adoption of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review in November 1996 work commenced on the Ashfield Local Plan Review with a plan period to 2011.

In July 1997 consultation took place on the Main Issues and Site Allocations Report. The Council's response to comments made on the report were subsequently published on 4th March 1999 together with the Ashfield Local Plan Review Deposit Draft.

Following detailed consideration of responses to the Deposit Draft Plan and revised Government guidance, a Second Deposit Local Plan was prepared to include proposed changes to the Deposit Draft Local Plan. The Second Deposit Local Plan was subsequently approved on 11th May 2000 for public consultation.

An Inquiry into unresolved objections to the Ashfield Local Plan Review was held between 13th February and 22nd May 2001. The Inspector considered all of the outstanding objections to the Plan together with a number of informal 'Inquiry Changes' (IC's) that the Council proposed at the time of the Inquiry.

The Inspector's Report on the Local Plan Inquiry was released for public consideration on 16th January 2002. The Council considered all of the Inspector's recommendations, and subsequently the 'Statement of Decisions on the Inspector's Report & Proposed Modifications to the Ashfield Local Plan Review' was published for consultation on 9th May 2002. A report of consultation was published in July 2002 indicating that no further material changes were required to the plan.

The Council resolved on 5th September 2002, to formally adopt the Local Plan in its modified form. The Council publicly advertised its decision to adopt the Plan, on the 22nd November 2002.



Mr. P.K. Johnson, Dip T.P., M.R.T.P.I.
Head of Development Services,
Ashfield District Council,
Council Offices,
Urban Road,
Kirkby-in-Ashfield,
Nottingham,
East Midlands,
NG17 8DA

THE REMAINDER OF THE DISTRICT

POLICY ST4 OUTSIDE THE MAIN URBAN AREAS AND NAMED SETTLEMENTS PERMISSION WILL ONLY BE GIVEN FOR:-

- a) **SITES ALLOCATED FOR DEVELOPMENT,**
- b) **DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATE TO THE GREEN BELT OR THE
COUNTRYSIDE AS SET OUT IN POLICIES EV1 AND EV2.**

- 2.54 Policy ST4 allows for development needs outside the Main Urban Areas and Named Settlements. In general terms the areas covered by this policy relate to the countryside including the Green Belt, to other areas specifically identified for development and to smaller villages, or parts of villages not covered by ST3 above.
- 2.55 Sherwood Business Park is excluded from Green Belt and was declared as an Enterprise Zone by the Government in August 1995. The Enterprise Zone Scheme grants planning permission for B1, B2 and B8 uses together with a site suitable for hotel and conference facilities. Major inward investment has already been achieved within this key strategic site and it is anticipated that development of the whole area could be complete by 2000. In the unlikely event that development is not complete before the expiry of the Enterprise Zone designation in 2005 Policy ST4 and employment Policy EM1 will set the context for further development on the site.
- 2.56 Annesley and Bentinck Collieries were closed in early 2000. This policy makes provision for their development for new employment purposes. Both sites are allocated for employment uses under Policy EM1. Employment sites are also allocated under Policy EM1 at Blenheim Lane Industrial Estate and South West of Oakham Business Park to extend, and benefit from the presence of adjacent existing industrial areas in Nottingham City and Mansfield.
- 2.57 A general policy of restraint applies to all other areas outside the Main Urban Areas and Named Settlements. However, the southern part of Ashfield District lies within the Nottinghamshire Green Belt where the attitude towards development is even stricter than elsewhere in rural areas. Policies EV1 and EV2 explain in detail the limitations to development in the Green Belt and the remaining Countryside in Ashfield respectively'. Policy EV2, 'The Countryside', refers to those rural parts of Ashfield lying outside the Main Urban Areas and Named Settlements which are not in the Green Belt.
- 2.58 Structure Plan Review policy 1/3 indicates that, outside the Main Urban Areas and Named Settlements, permission will not normally be given for development, except for appropriate small-scale development in villages and development requiring a rural location. This is defined in policies EV1 and EV2 as appropriate development. The footnote to Structure Plan Review policy 1/3 states that in appropriate villages 'limited' means more than 'small-scale'. Further, small-scale refers to both the total level of development in each village as well as individual sites.



Ashfield Local Plan Review

Adopted November 2002