MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/13/72422

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Erection of 1no. detached steel portal frame building for manufaction of food stuffs with office/storage space at first floor level Chalcroft Enterprises Chalcroft Farm Burnetts Lane West End Southampton SO30 2HU

SITE VISIT DATE	11/7/13			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	X	Yes		No. If not why not…….

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Erection of detached building to be used for the production of beef burgers (B2 use class). The building has a mezzanine level that will be used for storage and accommodate a w.c. The steel frame building has a low pitched roof and measures 24.4m(w) by 19.8m(d) by 7.7m(h). The building includes a 3m(w) by 6m(h) roller shutter doors at one end with a smaller personnel doors at the side. There are a number of first floor windows around the mezzanine area. The proposal does not include an additional parking or landscaping. will rely on vehicle parking areas.					
BUILDING AREA	483m2 B2 floor area with an additional 120m2 mezzaine area					
TOPOGRAPHY	X	Level		Sloping …..		Other …
TREES		No	X	Yes, one tree close by of limited amenity value.		
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	X	Low railings				
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The building will be sited on the existing yard area, which is currently used for outdoor storage. The site has a mixture of buildings and structures some of which are in use and others vacant or derelict. The permitted uses include agricultural, meat production/ packaging, a farm shop and two residential dwellings.					
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The site is located in an area of open countryside and is accessed via a long lane off Burnetts lane. To one side of the access is a solar farm.					

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/13/72594	Single storey extension to an existing outbuilding to accommodate a cutting room and holding fridge.	Currently invalid
F/12/71539	Solar photovoltaic panel farm (7.3MW) and associated works including 4no. inverter housings, 1no. point of connection facility, access tracks, 2m high security fencing, CCTV cameras and diversion of existing public right of way.	Permit - Dec 12
F/11/69998	Construction of agricultural building to house meat preparation & packaging business, farm shop, stores & first floor office accommodation & formation of 34no. Car parking spaces with ancillary landscaping (amended scheme)	Permit – May 12
F/11/69344	Erection of agricultural building for the storage and maintenance of farm machinery, following demolition of existing hay barn	Permit – Apr 12
F/11/69140	Prior notification of intent to erect an agricultural hay barn (28 days for determination)	Permit – June 11
F/10/67674	Construction of agricultural building to house meat preparation & packaging business, farm shop, stores & first floor office accommodation & formation of 34no. Car parking spaces with ancillary landscaping	Refused – Dec 10 (dismissed on appeal)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
None	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Planning Policy	<u>Objection</u> The site lies in the countryside. The farm comprises a number of buildings in a mix of industrial, retail and residential uses, or semi derelict. The proposal is effectively for a new industrial unit attached to the meat-packing and processing business that is established on the site. Development Plan - Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001 - 2011 (saved policies). In the adopted Local Plan the relevant policies include: <u>1.CO</u> - presumption against development in the countryside other than for specified purposes or it meets the criteria in other policies of the Local Plan. The proposed development is not "necessary for agricultural, forestry or horticultural purposes" and a countryside location is not required for the proposed use. The development is not for any other use which might be appropriate or acceptable in a

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	countryside location and, as a matter of principle, is therefore contrary to the core countryside policy of the Council. 5.CO - enables proposals for farm diversification subject to a number of criteria including environmental impacts and relationship to the agricultural enterprise. The business at Chalcroft may have started as a business processing meat produced on the farm but is now understood to be a mainly industrial process dealing with processing and packing of imported meat from a number of farms in the wider area for wholesale and local sales. The development represents an extension of this industrial process, and does not meet the criteria for agricultural diversification. Policies 10.CO, 11.CO and 15.CO refer respectively to the replacement, extension and re-use of non-residential buildings in the countryside. Policy 17.CO refers to redevelopment of established commercial, industrial or storage sites outside the urban edge. The proposal does not represent any of these forms of development, but is an entirely new structure situated in the open countryside adjoining the farm buildings. It is therefore contrary to the principles of development in the countryside. The applicants appear to have had no regard to the potential to re-use or replace any of the existing buildings within the farm complex, including an existing steel frame structure currently used for storing boats, or any of the semi-derelict structures. In terms of policy 59.BE, the proposal is of undistinguished design and appearance, more suited to an industrial estate than a countryside location. Its visual impact in this generally open countryside would be intrusive, contrary to policy 18.CO. The proposal is therefore contrary to the saved policies of the existing adopted Local Plan. Other material considerations National Planning Policy Framework The NPPF generally supports sustainable economic growth in rural areas through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings (para. 28). It also requires good design, stating that permission should refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029 Policies S8 and DM1 refer. Policies DM16 and DM17 refer to extensions and replacement and re-use of rural employment buildings respectively and are not relevant in this instance. Conclusion

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	The proposal is contrary to the saved policies of the adopted Development Plan, to national planning policies and the emerging policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029. Note: in respect of their Design and Access Statement, the applicants should be advised that there is no green belt in Eastleigh Borough, and that all planning policy statements and guidance notes have been replaced by the NPPF.
Engineering and Transportation	No objection in principle The access road in/out of the site has good visibility, and is of an acceptable condition to service the development. However it is relatively long and single tracked. On a site visit, whilst exiting the site, along the final stretch of the single track two oncoming vehicles had to wait for me to pass them at the access junction before proceeding, as there were no localised passing points. If a third vehicle had of arrived wishing to access the site, it would have caused an obstruction on the highway. This is more likely to occur with the higher trip rate associated with the proposals, and so further passing lay-bys should be provided to mitigate against this scenario. Drawings demonstrating where these would be located should be provided by the developer with implementation to follow. It is not known whether any of the previous applications have been built out, and as such whether any identified passing places have been constructed. The developer should clarify. In regard to transport Developer Contributions, as a new build development, the proposals are liable to a request for DC's. In accordance to the HCC Transport Contributions Policy, this equates to £8,280 (+ indexation). These funds would be allocated to schemes in the local vicinity which are either of benefit to the users of the proposed development, or go to mitigate against issues caused by the development. Full details of identified transport schemes can be provided if required, and can be seen in the Eastleigh Borough Transport Statement http://www3.hants.gov.uk/eastleigh-transport statement-final-2012.pdf
HCC Archology	Although there are no archaeological issues I wish to raise in this instance there are a number of historic buildings within the vicinity and the advice of your conservation officer should be sought.
West End Parish Council	Councilors' felt that they did not have enough detail to make a decision on the plans submitted.
Environmental Health	No objection in principle. We do however note that the development site is currently a farm and the applicant intends to reuse the excavated soil to infill ruts in the tracks on the farm. We recommend that the applicant is advised that if any information come to light during the construction works that

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	indicates the presence, or the possible presence of, 'made ground' or of contaminated soils, then this should be brought to the attention of the Environmental Health Service.
Biodiversity	No objection. The new building will be erected in a location which does not have any existing biodiversity interests.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Countryside Outside Built-up Area Boundary

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011): 1.CO, 5.CO, 17.CO, 18.CO, 59.BE, 100.T, , 104.T, 147.OS & 191.

Pre-Submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2011-2029): S8, DM1, DM14, DM23, DM24 & DM37

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places & Planning Obligations

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Not within Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area

Within Area 9 of the Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough (Background Paper)

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

None

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, trees, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	See below	X	Consultation responses have been noted and will be discussed in the assessment section. Appropriate conditions will be applied if the scheme is to be permitted.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	See below	X	None received

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of Circular 05/05 saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and supplementary planning document. Planning obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Sustainable Transport.

The applicant has not agreed to secure the contributions through a direct payment or unilateral undertaking.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) came into force in March 2012 and introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF defined sustainable development as having three dimensions: environmental, economic & social. The NPPF states that weight should be given to relevant policies in existing and emerging plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

The most consistent local plan policies are:

Policy 17.CO relates to the redevelopment of existing authorised commercial sites outside the urban edge, with a requirement to assess the use, design/scale/layout/use of materials to be in keeping with its surroundings and that the development does not result in significant increase in traffic generation.

Policy 18.CO requires development to respect the intrinsic character of the landscape area.

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

Character and Appearance

The proposal is for a detached building that will be used for the production of beef burgers. The building is large in scale (at more than 24m wide by 19m deep) and its first floor windows emphasise its substantial two storey bulk. The building is industrial in appearance with steel cladding for the sides and sheet metal roofing. Overall the structure is a plain design with little ascetic merit and is at odds with the barn style buildings traditionally found within rural areas.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposed building is sited on the very rear edge of Chalcroft farm where it would be highly visible from the surrounding open countryside. As such it is considered that the buildings bulk and industrial appearance would form an imposing and urbanising structure detrimental to the character and appearance of its rural surroundings. The building will also result in the loss of an adhoc area of open storage, which will put increasing pressure on the site to spill further into the surrounding fields.

The proposal will form part of chalcroft farm, which contains a collection of different buildings and structures. Within these are examples of attractive, traditional, farm buildings (such as the courtyard barns and old farm house) which enhance the rural feel of the site and reflect its countryside surroundings. The recently approved meat preparation/ farm shop was designed to resemble a large barn (approved under F/11/69998) and demonstrates that this form of development can be used for larger industrial processes. It is considered that the proposal should reflect this traditional buildings style rather than add to the industrial steel structures that currently blight the appearance of the site and surrounding countryside.

The proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with the NPPF, which places great emphasis on encouraging visually attractive buildings that respond to the local character and history of places. Paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor quality design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Use

The NPPF supports the expansion of enterprise in rural areas in order to promote economic growth. The building can be viewed as an industrial enterprise as it will facilitate the processing burgers on the site. However, the supporting information suggests that this will mainly be an automated process with no increase in man power. No detailed information has been provided as to the nature of the business or whether it will provide any significant economic benefits to the existing businesses on site or the local community. Therefore little weigh can be given to this issue.

Traffic

The submission does not explain how raw materials/ products will be delivered to/ from site and no infrastructure has been proposed to support the development. The size of the building suggests this will be a large business, which has the potential to significantly increase traffic generation. The site is accessed via a long narrow lane with limited passing places. The lane is already well used and it may not be capable of accommodating significant traffic increases without further road improvements (such as laybys). Also any substantial increase in traffic will have a further urbanizing impact on the countryside and knock on effect to the local road network. The proposal makes no contribution towards Sustainable Transport projects within the locality, which would help to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure.

Other issues

- The building is a reasonable distance from residential dwellings and so will not adversely

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

impact the amenity of residents by way of a loss of light, outlook, privacy or noise.

- The new building will be erected in a location which does not have any existing biodiversity interests or protected trees.
- The site is not in an area of archaeological importance.
- The proposal is for an industrial use and will not have any social benefits.

Conclusion

The industrial design and large scale of the building does not reflect the rural character of the locality and its prominent siting would form an urbanising and imposing feature when viewed from the surrounding countryside. The submission fails to consider the impact the building would have on the sites rural environmental or provide economic justification for the building in terms of the benefits to existing businesses on the site or wider locality. It also fails to explore other options for the business, such as the redevelopment of vacant buildings present on site or consideration given to a smaller more traditional style building both of which would significantly reduce the impact the proposal has on its countryside location.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to refuse