**Case No:** 25/00146/FUL

**Proposal Description:** The removal of an existing barn building and in its place, the

creation of two tourist accommodation units with designated

parking area and alterations to access track

Address: Willow Farm Hensting Lane Fishers Pond Hampshire

Parish, or Ward if within Colden Common PC

Winchester City:

**Applicants Name:** Mr Lee Purse Case Officer: Liz Young

Date Valid: 30 January 2025

**Recommendation:** Permit **Pre Application Advice** Yes

## **Link to Planning Documents**

25/00146/FUL

https://planningapps.winchester.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple



© Crown Copyright and database rights Winchester City Council Licence 100019531

### Reasons for Recommendation

The development is recommended for permission as it is considered that the use, scale and design of the proposals would be sufficiently low key for the purposes of LPP1 Policy MTRA4. The proposal also meets the objectives of the NPPF in relation to enabling the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas. The development design (alongside the various mitigation and enhancement measures to be secured) has fully addressed concerns raised by the Case Officer during the consideration of previous applications on the site and would ensure the proposal would not give rise to significant adverse impacts upon the local environment, highway safety or neighbouring residential amenity.

### **General Comments**

The application is reported to Committee due to the number of objecting representations received contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

This application is a resubmission which follows on from three previously withdrawn applications which also proposed the construction of two detached holiday lets in place of the existing barn. The most recent of these (reference 23/02644/FUL) was withdrawn in response to concerns raised in relation to the validity of the application / ownership certificate and the need to make changes to the red line boundary. During the processing of these earlier applications the development design had evolved in order to address concerns relating to potential impacts upon local character and also the need to regularise some small scale alterations undertaken to the access to the site. The key aspects of the scheme essentially remain the same as the previous submission notwithstanding some adjustments to roofline, fenestration, access and internal site layout (these changes having been made in response to concerns raised by the Case Officer).

## **Amendments to Plans Negotiated**

Following on from the initial validation and publicity of the application, various amendments and updated information has been received to support the application. These are summarised below.

## Re consultation from 24 April 2025

Updated information was submitted by the Applicant to address concerns raised by the Highways Authority. These changes were formally republicised for the statutory time period (consultees, neighbours, Parish Council, site notice, press advertisement).

### Re-consultation from 16 May 2025

Amended plans were received showing an updated site layout to enlarge the parking / turning space within the site in order to address concerns raised by the Highways Authority. Again, these changes were formally re-publicised for the statutory time period (consultees, neighbours, Parish Council, site notice, press advertisement).

#### Re Consultation from 24.06.2025

This round of publicity followed on from the receipt of an updated nutrient report, amended package treatment plant specification and an updated transport assessment. Again, these changes were formally re-publicised for the statutory time period (consultees, neighbours, Parish Council, site notice, press advertisement).

## Further Amendments received 8.07.2025

On 8 July updated north and south elevations were provided to ensure these elevations showed clearly the rooflights and solar array which were already included on the roof plan. These plans were not re-publicised owing to the fact that the changes were of a minor nature and sought to ensure consistency across all the drawings. The plans included no changes which were considered to materially alter the character of the scheme as a whole.

A revised nutrient budget and nutrient were submitted by the Applicant on 23 July to ensure the budget accurately reflected existing land use / site area. Again, it was not considered necessary to re-publicise this information as it has no material impact upon the character of the development being considered.

The various comments received in respect of the above re-consultations are summarised below under the heading of Representations.

## **Site Description**

The application site comprises a parcel of agricultural land along with a section of private access track and is located within relatively rural surroundings. The site measures approximately 0.5 hectares and is currently occupied by various structures including a barn, a polytunnel, a shipping container and various dilapidated structures. The access track runs past Elm Farm which is Grade II listed along with its associated farm buildings. This neighbouring property lies immediately south of the application site. The access track is also shared with Park View House and its associated annexe (which lies on elevated ground immediately north of the application site) along with a number of field accesses. The majority of the site is elevated above the level of the gravel track which bounds its east and north boundaries. The land continues to slope upwards to the north west. The boundary with the track comprises a steep vegetated bank (including a number of trees). The South Downs National Park and a public right of way (PROW) lie just under 170 metres to the north east of the site.

## **Proposal**

Consent is sought to replace the existing barn (located in the north east corner of the site) with a two storey building which would form two semi-detached self contained holiday lets. The replacement building would be located in the same position as the existing barn. The external footprint of the building itself would measure approximately 110 square metres, although the overall footprint including the raised courtyard area which would wrap around the building would measure just under 200 square metres (a similar footprint to the existing building). Each unit would comprise two bedrooms.

Overall height above existing ground level (inclusive of the proposed raised terrace) would measure approximately 7 metres (approximately the same height as the existing building).

External facing materials would comprise rendered block work and timber cladding to the external walls, with corrugated metal roofing. New hardsurfaced areas would be gravel.

In addition to the main building a mower / storage shed would be erected in the north west corner of the site, and a parking and turning area (incorporating four parking bays) would be formed to the south of the building.

This application also seeks to regularise recent works undertaken to widen the access slightly (a very slight enlargement to the northern splay where it joins the shared access track off Hensting Lane). The access splay has effectively been widened from 10.7 metres to 14.3 metres as a result of these works.

The proposed development would be served by a package treatment plant (PTP) (also included as part of the current application submission drawings) and this would be located

just over 9 metres to the south of the proposed holiday let building. Details of the PTP specification and performance have been included in the application documentation.

## **Relevant Planning History**

92/01510/OLD - Use of barn for storage of coffins, ironmongery and materials, also extension to provide staffroom. PER 10th September 1992.

15/00259/FUL - Removal of existing polytunnel; extensions of existing building on west and east sides; continued storage use and change of use to light industry. WDN 16th April 2015.

20/02655/FUL - Alterations to and refurbishment of existing building and mixed use for light industrial, storage and ancillary offices. Provision of parking and turning areas.. REF 23rd March 2021.

21/01933/FUL - Alterations and refurbishment of existing building to provide the following uses: Office Use E(G)(i), Research and Development Use E(G)(ii), Light Industrial Use E(G)(iii). Provision of parking and turning areas and additional landscaping.. REF 21st October 2021.

22/02151/FUL - The removal of an existing barn building and in its place, the creation of two tourist accommodation units with improved access route and designated parking area. WDN 1st November 2022.

23/02022/FUL - The removal of an existing barn building and in its place, the creation of two tourist accommodation units with improved access route and designated parking area; Package Treatment Plant (AMENDED PLANS). WDN 18th October 2023.

23/02644/FUL - (Amended description and Plans - 18/03/24, further amended red line plan 03/04/24) The removal of an existing barn building and in its place, the creation of two tourist accommodation units with designated parking area, alterations to access track. WDN 8th June 2024.

#### Consultations

<u>Service Lead – Built Environment (Historic Environment)</u> – No objections subject to conditions:

- No objections raised in relation to the general principle of replacing the barn
- No specific heritage concerns notwithstanding the presence of listed buildings in the locality
- Neutral impact upon existing buildings in comparison with the existing situation
- Whilst replicating the character of the existing building is not ideal, the reduced size would ensure harmful impacts would be avoided
- Further details required on external materials, and rooflights (to be secured through conditions)
- Noted there have been some fenestration alterations since the last submission, and the latest design would result in slightly lesser light spillage from windows

<u>Service Lead – Engineering (Drainage)</u> – No objection subject to conditions:

- The surrounding area is susceptible to surface water flooding, with steep slopes these site characteristics must be carefully considered in the drainage design
- In accordance with best practice, on-site infiltration testing should be carried out
- If infiltration is found to be suitable, the calculated infiltration rate should be used to inform the design of the soakaway or any other infiltration-based Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS)
- Details of the sustainable drainage of the proposed driveway and parking area is essential to demonstrate how surface water runoff will be managed so as not to discharge towards Hensting Lane
- Surface water drainage system must be designed to accommodate runoff from all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100-year event, with allowances for climate change (currently 45%) and urban creep (10%)
- Given the sloping nature of the site, the design should incorporate appropriate mitigation and control measures
- A package treatment plans is accepted in principle but means of discharge for the treated effluent should be clarified
- Site suitability for a drainage field should be confirmed through percolation testing

<u>Service Lead – Sustainability and Natural Environment (Ecology)</u> – No objections subject to conditions:

- The recommendations within the ecology report should be conditioned
- An external lighting condition should also be imposed to ensure boundary features and habitats are not illuminated
- A legal agreement is required to secure biodiversity gains to cover the 30 year period and also to secure monitoring fees

<u>Service Lead – Sustainability and Natural Environment (Landscape)</u> – No objections subject to conditions:

- Insufficient details relating to the nature and specification of planting proposals and hard landscaping
- Recommend a condition securing details of existing and proposed ground levels, means of enclosure, hard surfaces, services, planting and timescales for implementation

<u>Service Lead – Sustainability and Natural Environment (Trees)</u> – No objections subject to conditions

<u>Service Lead – Public Protection (Environmental Health)</u> – No objections subject to conditions being imposed in respect of contaminated land (as previous activities on site have the potential to give rise to soil contamination)

<u>WCC Waste Collection Team</u> - If proposal is for a holiday let, it would need to be served by paid trade waste collection from any provider

Hampshire County Council (Highway Authority) – No objections raised:

• Note that visibility on the existing access will remain as it currently is

- Despite the constrained nature of the of the access track, it is noted that sufficient visibility is available to an approaching vehicle when egressing the site
- Satisfied with track shown for servicing / delivery vehicle
- Any impacts upon the local highway network are anticipated to be low in terms of trip generation
- There is adequate space for a vehicle to position itself off the main carriageway off Hensting Lane should a vehicle be exiting the private track at the same time
- The site is not being put forward for adoption to HCC as Local Highway Authority, and so whilst recommendations may be put forward, it is noted that any vehicle movement up and down the track would already be required to serve existing dwellings, there would simply be a slight increase in potential numbers

<u>Southern Water</u> – Do not wish to add any further comment beyond feedback previously offered on earlier planning applications (refer to comments dated 8th of December 2023 and 18th of April 2024)

Environment Agency - No objections raised

<u>South Downs National Park Authority</u> – Does not wish to comment on the development but recommend conditions relating to landscaping and external lighting

## Representations (First Round of Consultation):

Colden Common Parish Council - Neutral:

- Wish to make no comment on the application at the present time
- Concerns over the gradient of entrance into the site
- Further ecological survey work required

20 Objecting representations from 14 different addresses raising the following concerns:

### Development Principle

- All previous applications have been refused and the current application should also be turned down
- The proposal does not satisfy the criteria within LPP1 Policy MTRA4
- The proposal is for family housing not holiday lets in an area where new residential development is not supported by policy
- No binding commitment from the Applicant to ensure the units would remain as holiday lets
- Would set an unwanted precedent for similar developments elsewhere
- Insufficient planning justification
- The proposal does not involve the conversion of an existing building
- The only lawful use on the site is agricultural / there is no established commercial use on the site

- The proposal would not be small scale / low key for the purposes of LPP1 Policy MTRA4
- The proposal is not small scale as it is on a site of more than 1 hectare
- A single storey building would be more appropriate

## Design / Appearance / Visual Impact

- Prominent elevated site visible from the surrounding Grade 2 listed farmhouses/barns and the right of way network
- The Solar panels are not clearly shown on the elevations
- Incongruous form harmful to the character of the area
- Grand / imposing design and significant engineering works would not enable the proposal to meet the policy requirement of being low key
- Loss of rural character
- Uninspiring / inappropriate design
- No details of lighting have been provided

## **Amenity**

- Harmful increase in noise and light pollution (low background noise levels at present)
- The Applicant should be required to undertake a noise assessment
- Increase in overlooking towards land to the north of the site

## Heritage

- Would cause demonstrable harm to a series of eight listed building in a short stretch along Hensting valley (inter-related series of farm-houses, barns or cart sheds) through suburbanisation, increased and noise, vibration and light pollution
- The comments from the WCC Historic Environment Team do not have regard to the proximity between the development and Elm Farm
- Would be physically harmful to the listed Elm Farmhouse and curtilage walls, and to the old and delicate fabric and Elm Farm barn
- Traffic associated with the development will likely cause erosion and damage to the old walls and structures

## Highways / Access

- The Applicant has no right of way over the access track and has been advised of this
- Lack of clarity regarding access
- lack of a safe/efficient access by public transport, walking or cycling will increase reliance on travel by car resulting in increased carbon emissions
- Existing track is too steep / unsuitable / unsafe for the proposed development / larger vehicles
- Insufficient space for vehicles to pass
- Poor visibility
- No tracking information provided

- No visibility splays shown
- Inconsistent highway information across various document
- The Highways Authority and previous assessments undertaken by the Applicant have previously advised that retaining the access in its current form would not be acceptable (and that a passing space will be required)
- Excessive drag distance for wheelie bins / no scope for on site waste collection
- Inaccurate predictions of trip generation / harmful increase in vehicular traffic
- Harmful impacts upon highway safety / existing access is unsafe / congested
- Harmful impacts on the safety of non-car / recreational users / livestock movements
- The proposal will give rise to increase erosion / drainage impacts leading to the access track becoming degraded

## Flooding / Drainage

- The junction between the track and the road experiences regular flooding
- Proposal would not connect to mains sewer and would therefore increase pollution risks to adjacent land
- No details of the ground conditions or percolation test results to justify drainage design
- A flood risk assessment is required as the site exceeds 1 hectare in size
- Concerns raised over proposed soakaway design / soakaway design is unlikely to be effective
- Due to the topography and drainage conditions of the site it is essential that drainage details are dealt with before a decision is made

#### Construction

- Concern regarding the impact of substantial construction traffic to implement the demolition/new build housing/ground reprofiling, engineering and access
- Details of the material and the extent of excavation/retaining structures has not been provided

## Ecology

- The preliminary ecology report does not consider all land within the red line the WCC Ecologist is happy that the submitted EcIA adequately addresses the impact of the development
- The ecology report does not consider impacts upon toads
- The ecology report identifies the need to undertake further bat surveys
- Access alterations have not been taken into account in the submitted BNG metric
- The site lies close to SAC / SPA designations including Park Copse Ancient woodland

#### Trees

• The submitted tree report does not accurately reflect the proposed development

 Proposed access track would have a harmful impact upon retained trees / will necessitate the removal of trees / bushes

### **Nutrients**

- The application does not provide for nitrate and phosphate mitigation (the purchase of appropriate mitigation is not provided for in the application)
- The nutrient budget is incomplete

### Climate

• The climate change statement is 17 months out of date, is accurate and misleading and refers to the wrong red line plan

Toads On Roads- Froglife Coordinator – Objection raised:

- The access track and the surrounding terrestrial areas and ponds is a natural habitat for toads (of priority importance for the conservation of biodiversity under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006)
- Habitat should not disturbed be disturbed (including from additional traffic / parking / hard surfacing)

## Representations (Second Round of Consultation 24 April 2025):

One objecting comment raises the following concerns:

- Any surface water drainage solution for the site should not exacerbate the existing flooding problem (referring to Drainage Engineer comments).
- The proposed soakaway appears to be two metres higher than the building and three metres higher than the parking area (not in accordance with standard practice) and is therefore unlikely to be effective
- Insufficient details in relation to foul drainage provision, particularly with regards to the drainage field
- Suitable access should be provided for any lorries to empty sludge from the package treatment plant

## Representations (Third Round of Consultation 16 May 2025):

Three Objecting comments received from two different properties raising the following concerns:

### Procedure

• Concerns over the need to re-publicise

## Development Principle

The general principle of the proposed development has not changed

Proposal would not represent low key or small scale development

### Character / visual

- Obtrusive, prominent and incongruous development
- Urbanisation to the countryside/ rural setting
- Comment from Heritage Officer raise concerns over the appearance of the existing building and the scale of the proposal

## Highways / access

- Harmful increase in traffic
- No right of access
- No passing space (Highways previously advised that this is required)
- Inadequate visibility
- The access track suffers surface flood water and drainage issues
- Access to the site is on a steep gradient
- Inadequate emergence / refuse / servicing access

## Flooding / drainage

Proposal will exacerbate drainage issues on neighbouring land

## Landscape

- Harmful impacts upon natural feature bordering the access track
- Details of gates, entrance features, lighting and planting should be agreed up front

## Representations (Fourth Round of Consultation 24 June 2025):

33 objecting comments from five different addresses raise the following concerns:

## Plans / documentation

- Submitted Elevations are inconsistent with proposed layout indicated in the Applicant's Transport assessment
- Additional information provided does not adequately address previous concerns

## Amount of Development / Future changes

• The existing railway carriage might be converted to form a third holiday unit

### **Amenity**

• EP Officer has not considered in any way the impact of the noise, dust and vibration on the walkers, cyclists and livestock

## Character / visual

- The proposed parking area will have a harmful urbanising impact on the character of the area
- Insufficient information relating to landscaping measures

#### Historic Environment

- The Historic Environment Officer refers to the harmful impact of the proposal and its incongruous nature
- The Historic Environment has not seen / considered all necessary information
- Intensified use of the access track will be harmful to local heritage interests
- Reversing manoeuvres from larger vehicles associated with the development risks major structural damage to the walls of the heritage assets abutting the farm track

## **Ecology**

- Inadequate BNG calculations / report
- Harmful impacts on toads as a result of downhill drainage from the site and increased use of vehicular access
- These impacts have not been adequately assessed by the WCC Ecologist
- There are badger sets adjacent to the private access track

#### Trees

• Intensified use of access track will lead to harmful impacts upon trees

Highways and Access (with reference made to an enclosed topographical survey)

- The Applicant does not have a right of way along the track for the purposes of the new tourist accommodation development
- Significant trip generation having regard to both guests and servicing
- The existing access track is not adequate to serve the development and would be subject damage as a result of the development
- Harmful impact upon highway safety (in an area already prone to accidents) having regard to both cars, pedestrians and vulnerable road users
- Further highways information submitted is unclear / inconsistent around issues on visibility, access and gradients around access
- The width of the shared access track is inadequate and passing space is therefore required
- Concerns over lack of visibility between the site access to Willow Farm and Hensting Lane, and vice versa
- Inadequate tracking for larger service vehicles, emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles

## Nutrient Neutrality / Foul Drainage

PTP Certificate is out of date and should be updated

- Nutrient report incorrectly describes existing land use and development proposal
- There is nothing to demonstrate nutrient neutrality
- Nitrogen and Phosphorus loads are underestimated and will cause harm to adjacent land
- The Environment Agency should be consulted in respect of the package treatment plant
- The flood risks of the access track need to be considered

## Flooding / Drainage

- The junction between the track and Henting Lane is in a surface flood zone
- Inappropriate / inadequate siting of soakaway
- The package treatment plant should be sited so as to avoid harmful impacts on adjacent farmland
- Inadequate infiltration testing

#### Contaminated Land

- Contaminated land investigations should not be left to condition due to the site's drainage conditions, the nature and extent of potential contaminants on site and the potential for this to influence development design
- Potential contamination impacts could impact upon adjoining land uses

No supporting third party comments have been received during the publicity of the application.

## **Relevant Government Planning Policy and Guidance**

## National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 6 – Building a Strong Competitive Economy

Section 9 – Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 12 – Achieving Well Designed Places

Section 14 – Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Section 15 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 16 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

## National Planning Practice Guidance

Historic Environment (2019)

Natural Environment (2024)

Biodiversity Net Gain (2024)

### Winchester Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (2013) (LPP1):

Policy DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles

Policy MTRA4 - Development in the Countryside

Policy CP11 - Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development

Policy CP13 - High Quality Design

Policy CP15 – Green Infrastructure

Policy CP16 – Biodiversity

Policy CP17 – Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment

Policy CP19 – South Downs National Park

Policy CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character

# <u>Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations</u> (2017) (LPP2)

Policy DM1 – Location of New Development

Policy DM15 - Local Distinctiveness

Policy DM16 – Site Design Criteria.

Policy DM17 – Site Development Principles.

Policy DM18 – Access and Parking

Policy DM23 – Rural Character

Policy DM24 - Special Trees, Important Hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands

Policy DM29 – Heritage Assets

## **Supplementary Planning Documents**

- National Design Guide 2019
- High Quality Places SPD 2015
- Air Quality Supplementary Planning Document 2021
- Colden Common Village Design Statement 2022

## Other Relevant Documents

- Climate Emergency Declaration, Carbon Neutrality Action Plan 2020-2023.
- Nature Emergency Declaration.
- Statement of Community Involvement 2018 and 2020
- Biodiversity Action Plan 2021
- Waste Management Guidelines and Bin Arrangements
- Position Statement on Nitrate Neutral Development February 2020
- Historic England Guidance
- Conservation Principals Policies and Guidance 2008

## **Emerging Policy**

The Regulation 19 Local Plan has been agreed by Full Council and the examination is pending the Inspectors findings. Therefore, the emerging policies can be given appropriate and increasing weight in the assessment of development proposals in advance of Adoption.

## **Planning Considerations**

### Principle of development

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024) require that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Policy DS1 of the LPP1 is consistent with the NPPF which states in paragraph 11 that decisions should apply a presumption in favour of

sustainable development and that for decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay.

The development is not situated within a settlement boundary therefore countryside policies apply. In such instances, Policy MTRA4 of the Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) allows for low key tourist accommodation appropriate to the site, location and setting, provided that the development is in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan and unless material planning reasons indicate otherwise. This policy is consistent with paragraph 88 of the NPPF which states that planning decisions should support the "sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed, new buildings" and enable "sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside".

Policy MTRA4 does not define low key but indicates that proposals should not cause harm to the character and landscape of the area or neighbouring uses or create inappropriate noise/light and traffic generation. These factors will therefore be relevant in considering the extent to which any proposal would be sufficiently low key (and are considered in further detail below).

Contrary to third party comments LPP1 Policy MTRA4 also does not stipulate that all new tourism accommodation would be limited to the conversion of existing buildings (as opposed to the introduction of new built development). Therefore, the Development Plan does not rule out new built development to facilitate tourism uses. Furthermore, it should be recognised that this particular proposal involves the replacement of a larger building and that it would be confined to the same built footprint with each unit measuring just over 90 square metres internally. The proposed development would comprise two semidetached two bedroom holiday lets and would be of a scale consistent with various other proposals for new holiday accommodation permitted in rural parts of the District under the current Development Plan. Having regard to this and also the proposed removal of various other structures on site (and reduced amount of hardsurfacing), the physical scale of the proposal can be considered sufficiently low key for the purposes of LPP1 Policy MTRA4.

With regards to traffic generation, it is accepted that the lawful use of the site is agricultural (with any previous commercial use having expired under a personal condition), and that the development site lies in an area which would necessitate the use of a private car. However, it is recognised that holiday lets do not generate the same level of vehicular activity as they are typically not in continuous use throughout the year, because trips are not usually undertaken in peak hours and because occupants are more likely to share lifts. On this basis the two units could reasonably be anticipated to lead to a maximum of four two way movements when occupied. Having regard to this and the fact that the track is currently in use by adjoining land users (and already experiences a number of vehicular movements), it is concluded that the overall scale of the proposal is such that it would not materially increase overall levels of existing vehicular activity in comparison with the existing situation.

The occupation of the holiday lets would (in the event that consent was forthcoming) be restricted to any one occupier occupying any unit for a maximum period of 4 weeks and for no more than 3 times per year, with a break between each occupation, by the same occupier, of 4 weeks. The condition would also require the developer to maintain a register of the names of the occupiers of the unit, their primary home address and arrival and departure dates. This is an established and accepted approach which is applied to all

forms of new tourism accommodation permitted within the District under the current Development Plan.

For these reasons the proposal (in terms of both built form and associated activity) is considered to be sufficiently low key for the purposes of Policy MTRA4. The proposal also adheres to the objectives contained within the NPPF in relation promoting the sustainable growth of the rural economy and the principle is therefore considered acceptable in policy terms.

## Assessment under 2017 EIA Regulations.

The development does not fall under Schedule I or Schedule II of the 2017 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, therefore an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

## Impact on character and appearance of area

Planning policy acknowledges that when considering the impacts of development in rural areas it is necessary to have regard to both visual impacts alongside wider impacts upon tranquillity (such as noise and light pollution). These factors are recognised (by LPP2 policy DM23 in particular) as essential components of rural character. This policy also highlights that noise and lighting pollution may be more noticeable in rural areas due to the relative tranquillity of the surroundings. It states that the cumulative impact of developments will be considered, including any ancillary or minor development that may occur as a result of the main proposal.

LPP1 Policy MTRA4 is also relevant in that it seeks to ensure proposals should not cause harm to the character and landscape of the area or neighbouring uses, or create inappropriate noise/light and traffic generation.

The Winchester Landscape Character Appraisal places the site within the Durley Claylands Character Area, which it describes as a varied rural landscape, relatively well settled, consisting of numerous farms and loosely connected dwellings. The application site is considered to be reflective of these characteristics due to the presence of built form within and close to the site, and the mix of agricultural and equestrian uses in the wider area.

Whilst it is acknowledged that third party concerns have been raised in relation to the design and fenestration of the proposed building. In considering the current situation, the existing barn and other structures on site are not of any aesthetic or heritage interest and to some degree undermine the rural character of the area, particularly when viewed from the adjacent track. These structures cumulatively occupy a significant proportion of the site and impact upon views from the adjacent track. The proposal to remove the poly tunnel, shed, brick building and other structures would therefore bring about an overall improvement to the character of the area and would reduce the overall spread and proliferation of structures across the site. Furthermore, the proposal to replace the barn with a (smaller) building to be occupied as two holiday lets is not considered to be at odds with the identified landscape characteristics of the area (which notes the well settled character of the locality). The proposal would not result in the loss of any buildings or built / natural features which contribute towards local distinctiveness.

In terms of size and scale, the proposed replacement building would measure

approximately 7 metres above existing ground level (largely the same height as the existing building). The overall external floor area of the proposed building (approximately 110 square metres) would be less than that of the existing barn (just under 200 square metres). Whilst this excludes the proposed courtyard area which would wrap around the building (which would occupy the same footprint as the existing building), there would nevertheless be a significant reduction in the overall volume of built form on site.

With regards to design and form, there is no unifying architectural style of buildings in the immediate locality and the proposal to introduce timber cladding to the replacement building would bring about an overall improvement in design terms as it would ensure a softer, less harsh appearance. Whilst the design largely replicates the existing building, which is not of any notable architectural quality, the simple, functional form of the proposal would be sufficiently reflective of the former agricultural uses of the site. The proposal would not encroach any closer towards the site boundaries than existing buildings on site and the overall prominence of built form would not increase. The larger window openings would be positioned on the south elevation, facing into the site so as to minimise the impacts of light spill in the wider area. It is recognised that concerns have been raised in relation to the fact that the proposed PV array is not clearly identified on the submitted elevations. However, this matter has now been addressed through the submission of revised plans. In the event that consent is forthcoming a condition would be imposed securing full details of the position, section and external finish of the array (Condition 21).

Overall, it is considered that subject to ensuring an appropriate finish and specification (Condition 3), the design of the proposed building would preserve the rural character of the area and would represent good design as required by the NPPF.

With regards to layout and landscaping considerations, the previous application (reference 23/02644/FUL) included a proposal to re-configure the existing access track and to undertake significant associated groundworks. This would have resulted in the formation of a steep and prominent bank on the site boundary. It was previously made clear to the Applicant that utilising the existing access and retaining boundary hedge/trees was necessary to prevent any harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The current plans have addressed this issue and now show the access remaining in its existing form. Whilst the existing access has been subject to a very slight increase in width, these works (which were undertaken when the previous application was under consideration) have not impacted significantly upon the gradient of the bank, boundary vegetation or the overall character of the site when viewed from the track. Therefore, there is no objection to the retention of these works.

It is recognised that the Colden Common VDS requires new development proposals to provide an appropriate ratio between hard and soft landscaping, having regard to the character of the area. The proposed new hardsurfaces (excluding the paved courtyard area) would comprise loose gravel and existing boundary vegetation would be retained (as indicated on the submitted landscape plan). Having regard to this and the overall reduction in building footprints it is concluded that the VDS requirements would be met. In accordance with the High Quality Places SPD the proposed parking would be sensitively located close to the footprint of the main building. Overall, the proposed landscaping measures and site layout are concluded to be in accordance with relevant supplementary design guidance.

With regards to the potential for impacts upon views from outside the site, the building

would be visible in close range views from the track which runs past the site boundary (as this is the case with the various existing buildings on site). However, it has been established from a wider assessment of the area that because the site is well contained within a small cluster of rural development which is well screened to the east and the north by established trees, the proposal will not be readily visible in the wider landscape (including Hensting Lane and adjacent rights of way). This is the case even during winter months. With regards to cumulative impacts, there are no other significant development proposals adjacent or close to the site with the potential to give rise to significant adverse impacts as a result of being viewed simultaneously with the current proposal within the wider landscape.

With regards to potential impacts upon rural tranquillity, as identified above, the overall scale of the proposal is such that any additional vehicular movements associated with the development would be barely perceptible over and above that generated from the use of other properties and land on the track. This is because the proposal is for two small units of holiday accommodation. The increase in vehicle movements would not therefore cause a harmful reduction to the tranquillity of the area. With regards to external lighting impacts, a condition would be imposed to ensure no external lighting would be introduced to the site unless full details of siting and specification are agreed beforehand (Condition 25).

Overall, it is considered that the development would preserve local distinctiveness and landscape character, would minimise visual intrusion, and would also respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment, within and surrounding the site, in terms of its design, scale and layout as required by LPP1 Policies MTRA4 and CP20 and LPP2 Policies DM15, DM16 and DM23. The development is also in accordance with the relevant guidance contained within the Colden Common VDS and High Quality Places SPD.

## **Development affecting the South Downs National Park**

As identified above, the application site is located approximately 170 metres from the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

Government policy relating to National Parks is set out in English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 and The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) updated 2024. The Circular and NPPF confirm that National Parks have the highest status of protection, and the NPPF states at paragraph 189 that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in national parks and that the conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations and should be given great weight in National Parks.

LPP1 Policy CP19 states that new development should be in keeping with the context and the setting of the landscape and settlements of the South Downs National Park. It states that the emphasis should be on small-scale proposals that are in a sustainable location and well designed. Proposals which support the economic and social well being of the National Park and its communities will be encouraged, provided that they do not conflict with the National Park's purposes.

As identified above, the nature and size of the proposal is such that it is considered to be small scale. Due to the distance between the development and the SDNP, the scale of

the development and the presence of intervening features, an adverse visual impact on the National Park and its statutory purposes is not identified. Whilst it is potentially the case that filtered close range views towards the development could be possible in winter months, the overall scale and layout of built development within the site would not change significantly from the current situation, particularly when viewed from the South Downs National Park.

It is recognised that the SDNP is a dark skies reserve. However, subject to agreeing an appropriate lighting strategy for the development (to be secured through Condition 25) it is considered that any impacts arising from external lighting would not be significant or harmful.

With regards to considerations around recreational access and enjoyment of the National Park the Colden Common VDS refers to the fact that Hensting Lane "provides a narrow route towards the South Downs National Park, lined with trees and hedges" and "is much used by walkers, cyclists and equestrians for recreation and access to the adjacent National Park". It states that the countryside access plan for the SDNP identifies limited accessibility to recreational routes as one of a number of issues to address. Accordingly, the VDS guidelines state that new development should preserve and enhance countryside access. Having regard to the proximity between the development and the South Downs National Park and the public right of way network alongside the popularity of Hensting Lane for recreational access it is considered that the proposal would meet these objectives and would promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public.

The views of the South Downs National Park Authority have been sought, and no adverse comments have been received in response.

Taking account of the Park's purpose to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area and promote understanding of its special qualities, the development has a neutral impact and does not therefore adversely conflict with the statutory purposes of the SDNP designation.

## **Historic Environment**

There are no heritage assets within the application site. The site does not lie within or adjacent to any conservation areas.

Elm Farmhouse, a Grade II listed farmhouse with associated Grade II listed barn lies immediately to the south of the site. Hensting Farm, a grade II Listed Farmhouse and associated Grade II Listed Barn lie just over 160 metres to the north east.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

LPP1 Policy CP20 and LPP2 Policy DM29 together seek to ensure that development preserves and enhances heritage assets and their settings. LPP2 Policy DM29 states that works which would cause an unacceptable level of harm to the special interest of heritage assets or their setting, or would lead to the unsympathetic subdivision of their grounds, will

only be permissible in exceptional circumstances, or in the case of higher grade heritage assets in wholly exceptional circumstances.

Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that 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.

The historic environment section of the Planning Practice Guidance further outlines the role of the Local Planning Authority in considering the effects of new development that are in the vicinity of or affect the setting of listing buildings and heritage assets. Paragraph 215 states that 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. It 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.

It is acknowledged that third party concerns have been raised that the proposal would cause harm to local heritage interests (specifically 8 listed buildings in the locality) through suburbanisation, increased and noise, vibration and light pollution and that the proposal would be physically harmful to the listed Elm Farmhouse its curtilage walls and barn. Concern is also raised that traffic associated with the development will likely cause erosion and damage to the old walls and structures.

There is a distance of approximately 50 metres between the application site and Elm Farm to the south. The degree of intervisibility between these two sites is limited due to the extensive boundary screening and intervening features. The proposal would not encroach towards the listed building and would not have a greater visual impact upon its setting in comparison with the existing situation (particularly when having regard to the removal of the proliferation of existing structures across the site). The proposal also offers the opportunity to introduce a number of improvements to landscaping arrangements across the site including new native planting.

As identified above the overall scale and design of the proposal would therefore be appropriate to its context and this would ensure the setting of Elm Farmhouse would not be adversely impacted as a result of the development.

For the same reasons the proposal would also not give rise to significant harmful impacts upon other listed buildings (including Hensting Farm) in the wider area, particularly when taking into account the very limited intervisibility between these buildings and the application site. It should also be recognised that the main features which contribute to the setting of many of the historic farmsteads in the area are their associated buildings and agricultural land. The application site does not play a specific role in this character and as such does not contribute towards their setting.

Having regard to the modest scale of the development and the presence of residential development in the immediate locality it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to a material increase in noise, vibration and lighting impacts to the extent that it would unacceptably undermine local heritage interests. The access track to the site lies approximately 20 metres from Elm Farm and is even further away from the listed barn.

Whilst the curtilage wall to Elm Farm lies adjacent to the track, there is no evidence to suggest that this is unstable or that its long term retention would be compromised by any traffic associated with the development, particularly when having regard to the fact that the track is already in regular use.

With regards to the construction phase impacts, in the event that consent is granted a Construction Method Statement would be secured through conditions (Condition 5). This would include measures to mitigate any potentially harmful impacts upon heritage assets close to the site.

The WCC Historic Environment Officer raises no objections to the proposed development and overall, it is concluded that the proposal would preserve the setting and significance of adjacent listed buildings as required by Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990). The Historic Environment Team do not raise concerns in relation to the proposal and overall, it is considered that the proposals would preserve the character and setting of the listed building as required by LPP1 Policy CP20 and LPP2 Policy DM29.

## **Neighbouring amenity**

The closest neighbouring property to the application site is Elm Farmhouse. As identified above, the degree of separation between the two sites is such that there would not be any significant adverse impact towards this property, particularly when having regard to the fact that the main building would have a reduced floor area and would remain within the northern section of the site. There are also a number of trees on the southern boundary of the site which provide screening between the two properties.

As identified above, any vehicular activity associated with the use would also be low key and would therefore not give rise to any additional impact in comparison with the existing situation.

Park View House (located immediately north west of the site) is positioned on a higher level than the application site and whilst views of the development would be possible from the property, these would largely be limited to areas around its front driveway and parking area. The development would therefore not impact upon the privacy or give rise to any significant loss of light to the occupants of this property.

Any impacts resulting from external lighting would be controlled through condition 25.

Overall, it is concluded that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining land, uses or property by reason of overlooking, overshadowing or by being overbearing and would therefore meet the requirements of LPP2 Policy DM17.

## **Sustainable Transport**

The application site is accessed directly from a private unmade track (which does not include any formal public right of way and will remain unadopted). No alterations are proposed at the access between the track and Hensting Lane (an unclassified highway).

It is acknowledged that various third party concerns have been raised in relation to parking and access considerations. These comments include references to highway concerns

raised previously in respect of application references 20/02655/FUL and 21/01933/FUL. Both of these cases proposed a different development to that of the current application (specifically the use of the existing building for light industrial, storage and ancillary offices). The main concern raised in respect of these earlier applications therefore related to the fact that the use proposed would have resulted in larger vehicles accessing the site. Furthermore, there was a lack of certainty about the frequency and type of vehicle movements that would result from unspecified uses. The current proposal (which would not involve any form of industrial use) would not have a comparable impact to these earlier proposals in terms of the nature and number of vehicle movements.

Leaving aside any vehicular activity generated by any activities taking place within the site at present (which does not appear to have any lawful commercial use other than agricultural), the introduction of two holiday lets would not give rise to a significant or harmful increase in vehicle movements when considered alongside any vehicular activity taking place on the main track in association with the adjacent land uses. As identified above, it is recognised that holiday lets do not generate the same level of vehicular activity as residential uses as they are typically not in continuous use throughout the year, because trips are not usually undertaken in peak hours and because occupants are more likely to share lifts. On this basis the two units could reasonably be anticipated to lead to a maximum of 4 two way movements when occupied. Accordingly, the Highways Authority have confirmed that the proposal is likely to have a negligible impact upon highway safety. Whilst third party concerns refer to historical accidents which have taken place on the site is not anticipated that the proposed development would exacerbate the risk of accidents over and above the current situation (with a recent incident having been attributed to adverse weather conditions).

It should be highlighted that because the development involves less than five dwellings, it is primarily subject to Hampshire County Council standing advice. Furthermore, as the proposal would not impact upon a classified road and would not involve a new or altered access to an adopted road there is no statutory requirement to consult the Highways Authority. The views of the Highways Authority have nevertheless been sought in light of the various objections received.

The relevant standing advice includes a requirement for vehicles to be able to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear, and that any gates provided should be set back a distance of 6m from the edge of the carriage way of the adjoining highway. In considering these requirements, the Applicant has advised that the gates will remain in position and that they are already more than 6 metres from the track. The plans also indicate that adequate turning space would be provided within the site to avoid the need for vehicles reversing onto the track. The relevant requirements contained within the Standing Advice would therefore be met.

With regards to concerns raised in relation to emergency vehicle access, this is not included as a requirement within the relevant standing advice referred to above. Furthermore, the situation at the Application Site would be no different in this respect from other properties in the immediate locality.

The standing advice also does not set out a requirement for access to enable two vehicles to pass, or any specific requirements in respect of access for refuse vehicles for development of the scale proposed. It also states that for a development of up to 5 dwellings with access from an unclassified road it is unlikely that a refuse vehicle would enter the site. Having regard to the modest scale of the development along with the short

distance (70 metres) between the site access and Hensting Lane (where refuse collection currently takes place) the development is considered acceptable in this respect. Notwithstanding this, given that the proposal relates to a commercial use and that there would need to be a private arrangement for refuse collection it is considered appropriate to impose a condition requesting full details of any waste collection arrangements (including details of access and frequency) (condition 16).

Having regard to the assessment above, it is concluded that retaining the existing access in its current form is acceptable from a highway safety perspective. Both the track and Hensting Lane are lightly trafficked. It should also be recognised that research carried out in the preparation of Manual for Streets indicates that many of the criteria routinely applied in street design are based on questionable or outdated practice - and are failing to produce good-quality outcomes. For example, it showed that, when long forward visibility is provided and generous carriageway width is specified, driving speeds tend to increase. This demonstrates that driver behaviour is not fixed - rather, it can be influenced by the characteristics of the local environment (page 7 of the Manual for Streets). In this instance the constrained dimensions and surfacing of the track would reasonably ensure vehicles approaching the site are likely to do so at slow speeds thereby limiting the potential for any vehicle conflicts to occur. This is because, if vehicles encounter one another on the lane, they will do so at low speed. They will still be able to pass one another at the access junction on the track. On this basis there will not be any significant implications for the highway. This has also been confirmed in the comments received from the Highways Authority.

With regards to the concerns raised that the provision of four parking bays would amount to overprovision, the WCC residential parking standards sets out a requirement for two bedroom units to be provided with two parking spaces. Furthermore opportunities for on road parking close to the site are severely limited. The proposed development would meet this requirement based upon the submitted plans and the implementation of this parking would be secured through Condition 10. Having regard to this (and also the fact that the site is in an area which is not well served by public transport) it is considered that the level of parking to be provided is acceptable.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF recognises that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. In this instance it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not result in any significant harmful impact upon highway safety in comparison with the existing access and traffic conditions.

On this basis it is concluded that the proposed development would allow for access to, and movement within, the site in a safe and effective manner and would incorporate parking provision and vehicular access as part of the overall design of the scheme as required by LPP2 Policy DM18 and paragraph 114 of the NPPF.

## **Ecology and Biodiversity**

LPP1 Policy CP16 states that new development will be required to show how biodiversity can be retained, protected and enhanced through its design and implementation and also requires new development to avoid adverse impacts, or if unavoidable ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated/. This closely reflects the requirements of paragraph 193 of the NPPF which states that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development

cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

The application site does not lie within or adjacent to any designated nature conservation sites or irreplaceable habitats.

The application has been accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA), a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, Biodiversity Net Gain Metric and existing / proposed habitat plans. It is recognised that third party concerns have been raised that the EcIA does not consider all land within the red line. It should be highlighted that the only area excluded from the assessment includes the areas outside the Applicant's ownership (the private access track) which is not proposed to be developed and will therefore not be directly impacted by the proposal. Furthermore, the EcIA does consider potential indirect impacts arising during the construction phase of the development and the WCC Ecologist is happy that the EcIA fully addresses the potential ecological impacts of the development.

Steps have been taken to avoid impacts upon local biodiversity interests by retaining the development within the footprint of the existing building, hardstanding and bare ground areas. The proposals have been altered to retain the existing site access location and this would avoid potential impacts upon toads which are known to be present.

Surveys undertaken on the site have concluded that there are no bat roosts within existing buildings on site. The site lies within a green (low risk) zone for great crested newts. Furthermore, due to the nature of the site and the proposals, no significant impacts are considered likely and precautionary measures are deemed sufficient to avoid any unacceptable risk to invertebrates, amphibians, reptiles, birds, badger, bat activity, hazel dormouse and hedgehog.

It is recognised that third party concerns have been raised over the need to undertake further bat surveys. In accordance with current Bat Conservation Trust guidance, two dusk emergence surveys were undertaken in the 2024 survey season, covering both buildings with two surveyors. The surveys concluded the buildings to be likely absent of roosting bats. The WCC Ecologist considers this assessment acceptable and raises no specific concerns in relation to impacts upon bats subject to the recommendations within the ecology report being adhered to alongside a restriction on external lighting.

It is recognised that a number of third party concerns have been raised in relation to the impact the development would have upon toads. The EclA considers impacts upon this species and identifies that the most significant risk would occur during the construction phase, resulting in a temporary spike in the increase in large vehicles. The proposals will not necessitate any widening of the track or installation of gully pots, raised kerbs or destruction of suitable breeding or terrestrial habitat. On-site risks to common toad are considered low during the construction and operational phase due to suitable habitat being largely absent.

The EciA states that the construction phase is to avoid the toad migratory months between January and April and works will only occur during day light. It is stated that all contractors to be attending site will also be made aware of the presence of Hensting Lane toad crossing and are to be provided with an information pack prior to attending site detailing

measures to avoid toad casualties (including keeping speeds to no more than 20mph). Contractors will also be instructed to access Hensting Lane from the northern access between January and October (extended period for juvenile toads), to avoid passing the pond network that starts 400m south, where collision risk is higher. Road signs are to be installed on-site to remind contractors of the diversion.

Whilst the EcIA acknowledges that the operational phase of the development may result in an increase in the first 100m of the farm track and Hensting Lane by tourists, the accommodation is likely to be most popular during summer months outside of the migratory season and extent of use can be controlled. The amount of accommodation proposed is modest and the site is currently accessed via vehicles so already gives rise to vehicular traffic. Taking into consideration existing vehicle use and the proposed low density of tourist accommodation the increase in vehicle usage during the operational phase is anticipated to be low.

Once operational, steps will be taken to inform tourists that extra vigilance is required between the months of January and April. It is states that a sign will be installed at the Site exit during the construction phase and will be retained throughout the operational phase, reminding those leaving to be vigilant for toads crossing and drive with caution. The signage can also advise occupants to avoid accessing/leaving Hensting Lane from the south. Bin collection is to be arranged at the Site entrance to avoid HGVs going up the private track on-site.

With regards to concerns raised by third parties in relation to potential impacts upon badgers, the Applicant's assessment states that no evidence of badgers was recorded onsite and that foraging opportunities are limited (this would remain the case following development). The ecology report nevertheless recommends that before development a search for newly created setts within 30m of the construction zone should be undertaken and if burrows are recorded then an ecologist should attend site prior to any ground works occurring to confirm whether it is attributed to badger and if it is in current-use. In the event that an active badger sett is found within 30m of ground works the ecologist would advise on the necessary mitigation. The report also recommends that a timber ramp should be inserted into excavations to avoid badgers becoming trapped and that any temporary pipes will be capped to prevent badgers gaining access during the night.

The WCC Ecologist is satisfied with the ecological assessment undertaken and the mitigation measures proposed, and it is therefore concluded that the concerns raised in relation to impacts upon toads (and other species) would not justify refusal in this case.

It is recognised that biodiversity net gain is now required under the statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This seeks to ensure development proposals deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.

The submitted metric shows a 11.39% gain in habitat units and 62.3% gain in hedgerow units on-site. Whilst the WCC Ecologist has made reference to the opportunity to agree a habitat management monitoring plan (HMMP) prior to decision, this is not a requirement set out within the government's minimum information requirements. It should also be highlighted that the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain involves the discharge of the biodiversity gain condition following the grant of planning. Planning Practice Guidance

makes it clear that the determination of the Biodiversity Gain Plan under this condition is the mechanism to confirm whether the development meets the biodiversity gain objective. The guidance states that given this, it would generally be inappropriate, when determining a planning application for a development subject to biodiversity net gain, to refuse an application on the grounds that the biodiversity gain objective will not be met (unless it is concluded that the biodiversity gain condition is incapable of being successfully discharged).

It is considered that in this instance the information provided is proportionate to the type and scale of development, type of planning application, the onsite habitat impacted, and the extent of any significant onsite enhancements. Furthermore, having regard to the scale of the development and the fact that the HMMP would effectively work alongside a Section 106 Agreement and BNG Plan at condition approval stage, it is considered reasonable that the HMMP can be agreed as part of the BNG condition.

It is recognised that since the original submission of the application, the proposed site layout has been amended to accommodate an enlarged parking area. Whilst the BNG habitat plan (proposed) has not been updated to reflect the updated layout the Applicant's Ecologist has reviewed the updated site layout and advises that it does not significantly reduce the predicted BNG score and that the proposal would still deliver 10% on site BNG. The WCC Ecologist is satisfied with this approach but in any event the BNG Plan would need to ensure the proposal would adhere to the biodiversity net gain hierarchy (with any necessary off site gains being agreed through this approach). It should also be recognised that on site provision of BNG on small sites in many instances will not deliver the same level of benefits as strategic / larger scale provision.

The EclA also proposes various additional enhancement measures which include introducing woodland and heavy shade wildflower mixes and shade tolerant bulbs such as native bluebell. These measures would be secured though condition 26.

Whilst third parties raise concerns that access alterations have not been taken into account in the submitted BNG metric, it is evident from the submitted baseline and proposed BNG plans that the increased splay has been accounted for. Aside from this point it should be highlighted that in any event Planning Practice Guidance advises that retrospective development is exempt from the BNG requirement.

On this basis it is concluded that subject to the agreed measures being secured through an appropriate mechanism, the proposal would secure 10% BNG as required by the Environment Act 2021. Accordingly, conditions 7 and 8 would secure the submission of a BNG plan, habitat management monitoring plan and legal agreement to ensure the development would have a positive impact upon biodiversity.

Having regard to the above assessment and the various measures put forward by the Applicant it is concluded that the proposal would avoid unacceptable adverse impacts upon biodiversity, and would retain, protect and enhance biodiversity through its design and implementation whilst also providing a net gain of well managed, multifunctional green infrastructure. The development would therefore be in accordance with LPP1 Policies CP15 and CP16 and along with paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

### **Appropriate Assessment.**

The proposal (which relates to additional overnight accommodation) falls within the River Itchen Catchment, where foul water is distributed into the European designated areas Solent SPAs/Ramsar sites. In accordance with advice from Natural England and as detailed in Policy CP16 of the Winchester City Council Local Plan Part 1 Joint Core Strategy a net increase in housing development (overnight accommodation) within Winchester District is likely to result in impacts to the integrity of those sites through a consequent increase in Nitrogen and Phosphorus. As such, in the event that consent is forthcoming, a Grampian condition in line with the Winchester City Council Position Statement on Nutrient Neutral Development will be required to secure appropriate mitigation prior to occupation.

In this case the application has been accompanied by a nutrient budget and nutrient report which concludes that the development will generate 0.63 kg/ TN of Nitrogen per year and 0.84 kg / TN of Phosphorus per year. A European Sites checklist has also been included which confirms that the applicant is content that a Grampian condition would be imposed in the event that consent is granted to secure appropriate mitigation in relation to in combination impacts upon the water environment of the Solent sites.

The application will have a likely significant effect in the absence of avoidance and mitigation measures on European and Internationally protected sites as a positive contribution would be made. The authority has concluded that the adverse effects arising from the proposal are wholly consistent with, and inclusive of the effects detailed in the Winchester City Council Position Statement on nitrate neutral development and the guidance on Nitrates from Natural England.

The authority's appropriate assessment is that the application coupled with a mitigation package secured by way of a Grampian condition complies with this strategy and would result in nitrate neutral development. It can therefore be concluded that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites identified above in this regard. In this instance the Applicant has paid the deposit to secure the necessary nutrient mitigation and on this basis there is sufficient certainty that any impacts associated with the proposed development would be mitigated.

This represents the authority's Appropriate Assessment as Competent Authority in accordance with requirements under Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Article 6 (3) of the Habitats Directive and having due regard to its duties under Section 40(1) of the NERC Act 2006 to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Consideration of the Ramsar site/s is a matter of government policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

## Sustainability

Paragraph 161 of the NPPF states that the planning system should support the transition to net zero by 2050 and take full account of all climate impacts including overheating, water scarcity, storm and flood risks and coastal change. It also states that proposals should help to shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience. It required proposal to encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.

LPP1 Policy CP11 reflects these requirements and states that developments should achieve the lowest level of carbon emissions and water consumption which is practical and

viable and should apply the energy hierarchy through maximising energy efficiency and designing out the need for energy use in the first instance. LPP2 Policy DM16 also states that proposals should utilise the principles of energy efficient design, by means of layout, orientation, passive solar gain, and the design of buildings and spaces, as far as is compatible with the character of the area.

In this instance, information which supports the application indicates that the proposals will feature a higher level of insulation than is required for Building Regulations. The use of wide walls will also decrease the energy required to heat and cool the internal spaces. It is stated that the building will be a lightweight frame which will require less foundations than a masonry building, thus saving on dig and concrete usage in the ground. The existing building and site has various areas of concrete hardstanding which can be recycled into hardcore to use under the base of the inner slab. Solar panels are proposed on the southern roof slope of the building in order to power the interior lighting and some low watt level functions. Rainwater harvesting and heat pumps are also proposed to be incorporated in the development design and full details of these (along with their implementation) would be secured through condition 19

Therefore, it is concluded that as required by LPP1 Policy CP11 the proposed development would be designed to maximise energy efficiency and design out the need for energy use by means of the scheme layout and the orientation and design of individual buildings, making full use of passive heating and cooling systems as far as is practical.

## Sustainable Drainage

It is acknowledged that a number of third party concerns have been raised in relation to surface water, soakaway design and foul drainage provision, particularly with regards to the impacts of surface water draining onto the adjacent track / highway. However, the application site does not lie within or adjacent to a flood zone. The proposal (which would occupy a comparable footprint to the existing building) would also not see a significant increase in impermeable areas across the site (with the overall extent of hardsurfacing being reduced).

Third parties correctly identify that the proposed soakaway would be located at a higher elevation than the proposed building, which will in turn give rise to a need for further review as part of the detailed drainage design. The views of the WCC Drainage Engineer have therefore been sought. The WCC Drainage Engineer previously undertook a comprehensive investigation whilst the previous application (reference 23/02644/FUL) was under consideration, which established that a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) would be feasible for the site and that (subject to thorough site assessments and a sound design managing the development's runoff during any extreme storm events up to and including any 1 in 100-year event) a soakaway and drainage field for the site could reasonably be used.

The Drainage Engineer does not raise any significant concerns over the location of the proposed soakaway and having regard to the fact that the site demonstrates strong potential for infiltration-based SuDS, it is concluded that a well-considered, site-specific drainage proposal covering the building, car parking area, and access road would enable effective surface water management, adequately mitigating off-site runoff, particularly to the junction with Hensting Lane. On this basis the WCC Drainage Engineer raises no objections to the development, subject to the submission of a satisfactory SuDS scheme.

Therefore, there are no concerns over the ability of the developer to meet the requirements of the recommended drainage condition.

Feedback received from Southern Water in respect of previous applications advised that any development design should ensure surface water should not connect to the foul/combined sewer network, as this can lead to storm overflow discharges from sewer networks. Confirmation of these requirements being adhered to can also be secured as part of any detailed drainage design.

Overall, it is concluded that subject to obtaining full details of the proposed management or surface water across the site (Condition 6) the proposal would not give rise to significant adverse impacts from surface water drainage or increased flood risk in comparison with the existing situation.

With regards to foul drainage, a package treatment plant is proposed to be installed as part of the development proposals. The site does not lie within an inner source protection zone and the WCC Engineer raises no objections to this subject to obtaining further details prior to the commencement of development. In accordance with these recommendations, Condition 6 requires the submission of foul drainage details prior to the commencement of development. This will ensure a sufficient degree of confidence that the development will not result in unacceptable risks from pollution. The Environment Agency also raise no objections to the proposed development. Having regard to this alongside the fact that connecting to mains sewer is not viable in this instance and the fact that it is not the role of the City Council to focus on controlling pollution where it can be controlled by other pollution regulations (such as Environment Agency permitting) the proposed foul treatment measures are considered acceptable in this case. It should also be highlighted that the NPPF makes it clear that it should be assumed that these separate pollution control regimes will operate effectively.

Having regard to the characteristics of the site, the nature and scale of the development and the fact that it has been demonstrated that there is a feasible solution for both surface water and foul drainage for the development, it is concluded that subject to appropriate conditions, the proposal would ensure that adequate surface water drainage and wastewater infrastructure would be provided to service the development. The proposal would also not give rise to a harmful increase in flood risk. The proposal is therefore in accordance LPP1 Policy CP17 alongside paragraph 181 of the NPPF.

### **Trees**

NPPF paragraph136 recognises that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. It promotes opportunities to incorporate trees within development and to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible. LPP1 Policy DM24 states that development should not result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodlands, important hedgerows, special trees, distinctive ground flora and the space required to support them in the long term.

Colden Common VDS identifies that trees and hedges are an important part of the village landscape, and it recognises their role in providing screening to development and contributing to wildlife corridors which are characteristic of the village. Accordingly, guidance within the VDS seeks to ensure existing native trees and hedges are retained

and incorporated in new development and also that space should be provided for the planting of new trees and hedges.

None of the trees within or adjacent to the site are subject to tree preservation orders. However, a number of trees lie on the site boundary, and these are considered to be of notable amenity value whilst also providing screening to the site. These include a row of beech trees on the north boundary and cypress trees on the east boundary (alongside a number of smaller trees within the site).

The application has been accompanied by an arboricultural impact assessment and tree protection plan (which has been updated to reflect the amended site layout). This report establishes that the proposal will not result in the removal of any trees. Given that the proposed replacement building is the same height as existing, no more pruning of branches is likely to occur over and above that of ongoing routine work, which (subject to adhering to the relevant British Standard) is unlikely to have a significant impact on tree health or amenity.

Because the proposed building would be within the footprint of the existing building, construction is not anticipated to have any direct impact on the trees. Furthermore, service runs would avoid root protection areas and the proposed access alterations would not impact upon retained off site tree.

Whilst the proposed parking area would encroach partly within the root protection areas of the beech and cypress trees, this area has evidently been used in the past for parking and storage so will have been subject to some compaction. The use of a cellular confinement system (as identified on a tree protection plan) which is to be incorporated in the development design would minimise any further compaction and preserve underlying roots.

It is anticipated that any potential impacts upon trees arising over the construction phase can be mitigated to an acceptable level subject to tree protection measures (as identified on the submitted Tree Protection Plan) being implemented.

The WCC Tree Officer has reviewed the proposed development and raises no objections to the development subject to appropriate conditions being imposed to ensure works would proceed fully in accordance with the recommendations contained within the submitted arboricultural report.

Overall, it is therefore concluded that, in accordance with LPP2 Policy DM24 the proposed development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees, and the space required to support them in the long term.

### **Contaminated Land**

It is recognised that third party concerns have been raised in relation to potential land contamination impacts arising from previous uses undertaken on the site.

The site was previously subject to a personal consent (92/01510/OLD) for the use of the barn for storage of coffins, ironmongery and materials. However there have not been any other intervening uses since. Furthermore, Environmental Protection are not aware of any substantiated evidence of significant contamination sources on the site which would serve to justify an intrusive investigation prior to determination. To this end, given that some

commercial use has taken place previously it is considered proportionate to impose a condition requiring a land contamination risk assessment, preliminary site investigation, site investigation report and (where appropriate) a remedial strategy to be undertaken before development (Condition 13). This would ensure the proposal would not give rise to significant unacceptable impacts on human health, groundwater and surface water, or the wider environment as required by LPP2 Policy DM21.

## **Equality**

Due regard should be given to the Equality Act 2010: Public Sector Equality Duty. Public bodies need to consciously think about the three aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making. The weight given to the Equality Duty, compared to the other factors, will depend on how much that function affects discrimination, equality of opportunity and good relations and the extent of any disadvantage that needs to be addressed. The Local Planning Authority has given due regard to this duty and the considerations do not outweigh any matters in the exercise of our duty.

## **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

The proposal (in terms of both its physical scale, prominence and associated activity) would relate to the provision of low key tourist accommodation in accordance with LPP1 Policy MTRA4 and would not increase the impact of built development on the site. The proposal has been designed to minimise visual impact through its size, scale and also the removal of existing built form within the site and would incorporate sensitive and appropriate landscaping and external facing materials. The development is therefore in accordance with both local and national policy which together support sustainable rural tourism (including through the provision of new buildings) which respects the character of the countryside. The proposal would also enhance sustainable recreational access to the South Downs National Park in accordance with the objectives of the Colden Common VDS.

As required by paragraph 89 of the NPPF the development design would be sensitive to its surroundings, would not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and would exploit opportunities to encourage sustainable travel.

Subject to appropriate mitigation being in place (to be secured by the conditions set out in this report) the development will not give rise to unacceptably harmful adverse impacts upon ecological interests within or adjacent to the site, or significant impacts upon landscape, highway safety, flood risk, built heritage or neighbouring amenity.

It is recognised that a number of third party objections have been raised in this case (a number of which have been received from the same households). However, the number of comments alone would not be determinative of the outcome of the application as it is necessary to have regard to the materiality and nature of the objections raised along with the extent to which these demonstrate a conflict with the Development Plan or overriding material considerations. In this instance, having regard to the assessment above it is concluded that the concerns raised would not sufficiently justify refusal in this case, particularly when having regard to the nature and scale of other proposals for holiday accommodation permitted in other parts of the district under the current development plan.

It is therefore recommended that planning consent should be granted.

### Recommendation

PERMIT subject to the following conditions:

### **Conditions**

## **Preliminary Conditions**

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the following plans and documents received: -

### Plans:

- Location Plan Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-001 (Uploaded 3 February 2025)
- Proposed Site Plan Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-101 (Uploaded 15 May 2025)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Proposed Drawing Reference CLX-PCA24002-BNG2 (Uploaded 23 January 2025)
- Proposed Drainage and Services Plan Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-102 (Uploaded 16 May 2025)
- Proposed Landscape Plan Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-103 (Uploaded 16 May 2025)
- Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement Drawing Reference DS/86323/AC (Uploaded 16 May 2025)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-203 (Uploaded 15 May 2025)
- Proposed First Floor Plan Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-204 (Uploaded 15 May 2025)
- Proposed Roof Plan drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-205 (Uploaded 15 May 2025)
- Existing and Proposed East Elevation Drawing reference 2209-PCA-E-E-1502 (Uploaded 3 February 2025)
- Existing and Proposed North Elevation Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-E-N-1500 (Uploaded 8 July 2025)
- Existing and Proposed South Elevation Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-E-S-1501 (Uploaded 8 July 2025)
- Existing and Proposed West Elevation Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-E-W-1503 (Uploaded 3 February 2025)
  - Mower Store Shed Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-E-E-1509 (Uploaded 3 April 2025)

#### Documents:

- Nitrogen Neutrality Calculation (Rev P2 23 June 2025 CGS Civils)
- Ecological Impact Assessment (So Ecology 14 June 2024)
- Climate Change Statement (Paul Cashin Architects, November 2024)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment& Method Statement (Treecall Consulting Ltd 15 May 2025)

Reason: To ensure an acceptable design, scale and layout and to avoid adverse impacts upon amenity as required by policies DM16 and DM17 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (2017)

## **Pre-commencement Conditions**

3. No development shall take place above damp proof course level until samples or full details of proposed external facing materials (for both the main building and mower shed) have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and have been approved in writing. The development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable design, scale and layout and to avoid adverse impacts upon amenity as required by policies DM16 and DM17 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (2017)

- 4. A detailed landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The landscaping scheme shall include the following details:
  - a) Means of enclosure
  - b) Hard surfacing specification and materials
  - c) Planting details (including specification, planting density, maturity / size and layout)
  - d) Retained natural features
  - e) Establishment, implementation and maintenance schedule

The scheme approved shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. If within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees, shrubs or plants die, are removed or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, others of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, in the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site in the interests of visual amenity and to conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the SDNP

- 5. No development shall start on site until a construction method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include:
- (a) A programme of and phasing of demolition (if any) and construction work;
- (b) The provision of long-term facilities for contractor parking;

- (c) The arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works;
- (d) Methods and phasing of construction works;
- (e) Access and egress for plant and machinery;
- (f) Protection of pedestrian routes / adjacent track during construction;
- (g) Measures to protect habitats and species within and adjacent to the site (including toads);
- (g) Location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material, and plant storage areas;
- (h) Measures to avoid damage towards heritage interests close to the site

Demolition and construction work shall only take place in accordance with the approved method statement.

Measures to protect habitats and species shall be informed by the recommendations within the approved Ecological Impact Assessment

Reason - In order that the Planning Authority can properly consider the effect of the works on the amenity of the locality.

6. Detailed proposals for the disposal of foul and surface water shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. These details shall also include provision to be made to prevent surface water from the site discharging on to the adjacent highway.

The approved details shall be fully implemented before development commences.

Reason: To ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere, that opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding within the District are addressed and that wastewater infrastructure to service new development is provided as required by Policy CP17 of the Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy Adopted March 2013

- 7. Development may not be begun on site unless:
- (i) a biodiversity gain plan has been submitted to the local planning authority; and
- (ii) The planning authority has approved the plan. In making an application to discharge the biodiversity gain condition the following information shall be provided:
  - information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat;
  - (b) the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
  - (c) the post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;

- (d) any registered offsite biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity and the biodiversity value of that gain in relation to the development;
- (e) any biodiversity credits purchased for the development; and
- (f) any such other matters as the Secretary of State may by regulations specify.

Reason: To ensure an appropriate setting to the development and to secure a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with the statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

- 8. The development shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP), prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan under Condition 7 has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The HMMP shall include the following details:
  - (a) the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the HMMP.
  - (b) any necessary legal mechanism or covenant for securing the monitoring over the relevant period;
  - (c) the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
  - (d) the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development;
  - (e) a proposed definition of 'completion of development' in respect of the development hereby approved.

The approved habitat creation and enhancement works shall be implemented in full within six months of the date of their written approval and shall be maintained thereafter for a period of at least 30 years. Notice in writing shall be given to the LPA once the habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the HMMP have been completed

Reason: To ensure an appropriate setting to the development and to secure a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with the statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

9. No development shall take place until full details of the finished levels, above ordnance datum, of the ground floor(s) of the proposed building(s), in relation to existing ground levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between the new development and adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees.

10. The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed prior to the commencement of construction of special surfacing under tree canopies so that a pre commencement site visit can be carried out. Telephone 01962 848360.

Reason: To ensure the development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term as required by Policy DM24 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

11. No development, or site preparation prior to operations which has any effect on compacting, disturbing or altering the levels of the site, shall take place until a person suitably qualified in arboriculture, and approved as suitable by the Local Planning Authority, has been appointed to supervise construction activity occurring on the site. The arboricultural supervisor will be responsible for the implementation of protective measures, special surfacing and all works deemed necessary by the approved arboricultural method statement. Where ground measures are deemed necessary to protect root protection areas, the arboricultural supervisor shall ensure that these are installed prior to any vehicle movement, earth moving or construction activity occurring on the site and that all such measures to protect trees are inspected by the Local Planning Authority Arboricultural Officer prior to commencement of development work.

Reason: To ensure the development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term as required by Policy DM24 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

12. A pre-commencement meeting will be held on site before any of the site clearance and construction works begins. This will be attended by the site manager, the Arboricultural consultant and the LPA tree officer.

Reason: To ensure the development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term as required by Policy DM24 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

13. No development shall take place unless otherwise agreed in writing until a scheme to deal with contamination shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall conform to current guidance and best practice as set out in LCRM - Land contamination risk management and BS10175:2011 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites - code of practice; or other supplementary guidance and include the following phases, unless identified as unnecessary by the preceding stage and agreed in writing by the LPA:

- a) A preliminary site investigation or desk top study documenting all the previous and existing land uses of the site and adjacent land and preliminary conceptual site model identifying all identified potential risks;
- b) A site investigation report documenting the ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as appropriate by the preliminary conceptual site model as presented in the desk top study;
- c) A remedial strategy detailing the measures to be undertaken to remove or avoid risk from contaminants and/or soil gas identified when the site is developed and proposals for

future maintenance and monitoring. Such scheme shall include nomination of a suitably qualified person to oversee the implementation of the works.

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants

14. Where a potential for contamination to be present has been identified a site assessment is required to quantify risks to the developer during construction and to future occupants. It is important this is undertaken prior to development commencing to enable appropriate remedial solutions to be incorporated into the final design stage of the development (such as the need for contamination removal or treatment, design and installation of gas protection measures, the use / re-use of materials on site or the need for cover systems and to ensure protection to workers and the general public during the development.

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants

15. Protective measures, including fencing and ground protection, in accordance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement ref:- DS/86323/AC written by Andrew Cleaves of Treecall Consulting Ltd (uploaded 16 May 2025) and submitted to the Local Planning Authority shall be installed prior to any demolition, construction or groundwork commencing on the site.

Reason: To ensure the development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term as required by Policy DM24 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

## **Pre-occupation Conditions**

16. The approved development shall not be occupied until a waste collection management plan has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and has been approved in writing.

The management plan shall include the following details:

- A site plan clearly showing where the waste storage will be located and where waste collection will take place from
- Details to ensure waste would be managed in a sustainable manner
- Details of the timing and frequency of waste collection

The development shall thereafter be carried out fully in accordance with the details as approved.

Reason To ensure the approved development meets an acceptable standard of environmental quality and to allow for access to and from the site in a safe and effective manner, having regard to the amenities of occupiers of the site and adjacent land and the requirements of service providers as required by LPP2 Policies DM17, DM18 and DM19.

17. The approved development shall not be occupied until all existing structures (as identified by the red hatched lines in Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-101) have been completely removed from the site along with all resultant materials.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable scale and layout of development on site and to preserve the rural character of the area as required by policies DM16 and DM23 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (2017)

- 18. The development hereby permitted shall NOT BE OCCUPIED until:
- A) A water efficiency calculation which demonstrates that no more than 110 litres of water per person per day shall be consumed within the development, and this calculation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- B) A mitigation package addressing the additional nutrient input arising from the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such mitigation package shall address all of the additional nutrient load imposed on protected European sites by the development and be implemented in full prior to first occupation and shall allow the Local Planning Authority to ascertain on the basis of the best available scientific evidence that such additional nutrient loading will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the protected European Sites, having regard to the conservation objectives for those sites
- C) Information regarding the efficiency and performance of the septic tank has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
- D) A package treatment plant (PTP) management and maintenance plan has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and
- E) All measures forming part of that mitigation have been secured and submitted to the Local Planning Authority. That

Reason: To accord with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, and Policy CP11, CP16 and CP21 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1.

19. Prior to the occupation of the holiday lets hereby permitted an Energy Performance Certificate demonstrating that the holiday lets meet the BREEAM Outstanding standard shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be occupied in accordance with these findings.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable form of development consistent with the objectives of The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and to accord with the requirements of Policy CP11 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy.

20. Prior to occupation of the development the area shown on the approved plan for the parking and turning of vehicles (Drawing Reference 2209-PCA-DR-A-101, uploaded 15 May 2025) shall be provided and reserved for these purposes at all times.

Reason: To ensure that vehicles parked on the site and emergency vehicles are able to enter and leave in forward gear as required by Policy DM18 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

- 21. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the specification and location of the following must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- a. Air source heat pumps
- b. Rainwater harvesting
- c. Solar Panels

In the case of the solar panels, the submitted details shall include both elevation and section and details of the relationship with the roof. Development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

Development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details within 6 months of their written approval and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable form of development consistent with the objectives of The National Planning Policy Framework 2023 and to accord with the requirements of Policy CP11 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy and Winchester Air Quality SPD.

23. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, written verification produced by the suitably qualified person nominated in the approved remedial strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report must demonstrate that the approved remedial strategy has been implemented fully, unless varied with the written agreement of the Local Planning Authority in advance.

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

### **Other Conditions**

24. The tourist accommodation hereby permitted shall be used for holiday accommodation only which shall be limited to any one occupier occupying any unit for a maximum period of 4 weeks and for no more than 3 times per year, with a break between each occupation, by the same occupier, of 4 weeks.

A register of the names of the occupiers of the unit, their primary home address and arrival and departure dates shall be kept by the developer and shall be produced to the Local Planning Authority upon reasonable notice.

Reason: To accord with the terms of the application since the site lies within an area where residential properties would not normally be permitted.

25. No external lighting shall be installed on the site unless details of such proposals have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the specification, luminosity, operation and layout of lighting (to be informed by the recommendations contained within paragraph 5.2.6 of the approved Ecological Impact Assessment (So Ecology 14 June 2024).

The lighting must then be installed and implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure boundary features and habitats are not illuminated and due to the proximity to the South Downs International Dark Skies Reserve thereby ensuring compliance with policies CP16 and CP19 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (2013) and policy DM23 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (2017)

26. The proposed development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the recommendations contained within Sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Ecological Impact Assessment (So Ecology 14 June 2024). All enhancement measures identified on the compensation and enhancement plan (page 59) shall be implemented before the development is brought into use and shall remain in place for the lifetime of the approved development.

Reason: To maintain, protect and enhance biodiversity as required by Policy CP16 of the Winchester Local Plan Part 1: Joint Core Strategy Adopted 2013

27. No rooflights shall be installed in the approved building until detailed drawings of the approved rooflights (at a scale of 1:20 or larger) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include both elevation and section and details of the relationship with the roof. Development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable design, scale and layout and to avoid adverse impacts upon amenity as required by policies DM16 and DM17 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 (2017)

28. The Arboricultural Officer shall be informed once protective measures have been installed so that the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) can be inspected and deemed appropriate and in accordance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement Ref:- DS/86323/AC and Tree Protection Plan, Ref:- DS/86323/AC Telephone – Tree Officer. 01962 848360

Reason: To ensure the development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term as required by Policy DM24 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

29. No arboricultural works shall be carried out to trees other than those specified and in accordance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement Ref:-DS/86323/AC (Uploaded 16 May 2025).

Reason: To ensure the development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term as required by Policy DM24 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

30. Any deviation from works prescribed or methods agreed in accordance with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment Appraisal and Method Statement Ref:- DS/86323/AC (Uploaded 16 May 2025) shall be agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure the development would not result in the loss or deterioration of special trees and the space required to support them in the long term as required by Policy DM24 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations (LPP2)

31. Development shall cease on site if, during any stage of the works, potential contamination is encountered which has not been previously identified, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall not recommence before an assessment of the potential contamination has been undertaken and details of the findings along with details of any remedial action required (including timing provision for implementation), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to secure satisfactory development and in the interests of the safety and amenity of future occupants.

### Informatives:

- 1. In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF (2024), Winchester City Council (WCC) take a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, working with applicants and agents to achieve the best solution. To this end WCC:
- offer a pre-application advice service and,
- update applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application, where possible suggesting alternative solutions.
- 2. In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the "Officer Assessment" section of the report.
- 3. The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

## Winchester Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (LPP1)

Policy DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles

Policy MTRA4 - Development in the Countryside

Policy CP11 - Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development

Policy CP13 - High Quality Design

Policy CP16 - Biodiversity

Policy CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character

## Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management and Site Allocations

Policy DM1 – Location of New Development

Policy DM15 - Local Distinctiveness

Policy DM16 – Site Design Criteria.

Policy DM17 – Site Development Principles.

Policy DM18 – Access and Parking

Policy DM23 - Rural Character

Policy DM24 – Special Trees, Important Hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands Policy DM29 – Heritage Assets

4. This permission is granted for the following reasons:

The development is in accordance with the Policies and Proposals of the Development Plan set out above, and other material considerations do not have sufficient weight to justify a refusal of the application. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning permission should therefore be granted.

## 5. IMPORTANT - Biodiversity Gain Condition

Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the "biodiversity gain condition" which means development granted by this notice must not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

# This permission will require the submission and approval of a Biodiversity Gain Plan before development is begun.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve the Biodiversity Gain Plan, would be Winchester City Council

For guidance on the contents of the Biodiversity Gain Plan that must be submitted and agreed by the Council prior to the commencement of the consented development please see the link: <u>Submit a biodiversity gain plan - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</u>

6. Nutrient Mitigation and Package Treatment Plant (Condition 18)

Please be advised that in submitted details pursuant to Condition xx, consideration needs to be given to the long term management of the package treatment plant (PTP).

A principal concern with such installations relates to the failure rates and the lack of review and periodic upgrades via regulatory systems that apply to mains. With this in mind, Natural England recommends that a long term monitoring and maintenance strategy is required in the case of proposals served by PTPs to satisfy the competent authority that the system will operate effectively for the lifetime of the development.

These details should be agreed and outlined and secured through an appropriate legal mechanism before harmful in combination impacts upon European Sites can be ruled out. The strategy should consider appropriate funding, responsibilities and mechanisms to ensure compliance for the lifetime of the development. Consideration should also be given to site compliance checks, monitoring, securing corrective measures and replacement facilities, as necessary. Natural England advises that best practice measures are delivered and secured with these systems in all cases.

7. Please be advised that the Developer must contact the Environment Agency in order to establish whether the proposed package treatment plant requires a permit. It is against the law to operate without a permit where one is shown to be needed.

https://www.gov.uk/permits-you-need-for-septic-tanks/apply-for-a-permit

The discharge of domestic sewage associated with this development may be subject to General Binding Rules under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016 which provide a statutory baseline of good practice. You can find more information online at <a href="https://www.gov.uk/permits-you-need-for-septic-tanks/permits">https://www.gov.uk/permits-you-need-for-septic-tanks/permits</a> or contact the Environment Agency on 03708 506506.