

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/22/94435

Site Address: Mortimers Farm, Mortimers Lane, Fair Oak, Eastleigh, SO50 7EA

Case Officer: Summer Sharpe

Description: Alterations and extensions and conversion of 4 existing barns including Grade 2 listed Threshing Barn and Granary to create 4 dwellings, demolition of modern barn and construction of 5 new dwellings with associated gardens parking and car port/bat barn new sewerage treatment and new footpath on the southern side of Mortimers Lane.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Countryside • Surface water flooding • Listed buildings (The Farmhouse, the Main Barn and the Granary all Grade II) • Minerals & Waster Safeguarding		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Planning App no.	Proposal	Decision
X/19/86132	Removal of condition 2 (dwelling for sole use of agricultural worker) of planning permission Z/19357/012/00.	Refused (October 2019)
F/19/86151	Alterations and conversion of existing barns to form 4 dwellings and construction of 7 dwellings following demolition of modern agricultural buildings.	Refused (July 2020)
L/20/87787	Listed Building Consent: Alterations, demolition of modern ancillary structures and conversion of Listed and curtilage listed agricultural buildings to form 2 dwellings; and conversion of Listed Granary to summerhouse with creation of new doorway (amended description).	Grant Listed Building Consent (June 2020)
PN/21/90993	Prior notification for a change of use of Agricultural buildings to 5no. Dwellinghouses and building operations reasonably necessary for the conversion	Prior Approval Granted (September 2021)
L/21/91145	Listed Building Consent application for proposed alterations, and extensions to Grade II listed Threshing Barn and attached curtilage-listed shelter shed to create 2 bedroom dwelling and restoration of the Grade II listed Granary for ancillary/incidental residential use in association with adjacent barn.	Grant Listed Building Consent (December 2021)
F/21/91137	Proposed alterations, extensions and conversion of 4 existing agricultural barns (including a Grade II listed Threshing Barn and Grade II listed Granary) to create 4 dwellings together with the provision of associated gardens, parking, and turning areas, construction of a detached carport/bat barn, an underground pumping station and a new pedestrian footpath on the southern side of Mortimers Farm	Permitted (December 2021)
L/22/94460	Alterations and extensions and conversion of 4 existing barns including Grade 2 listed	Under Consideration

	Threshing Barn and Granary to create 4 dwellings, demolition of modern barn and construction of 5 new dwellings with associated gardens parking and car port/bat barn new sewerage treatment and new footpath on the southern side of Mortimers Lane.	
--	---	--

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☒
Representations:	<u>2no. Objections from 1no. person summarised as follows:</u> (a) overdevelopment, (b) highways issues, (c) impact upon rural fields/ landscaping, (d) impact upon River Itchen/ water quality, (e) climate change, (f) landscaping, and (g) impact upon protected species. <u>2no. Support comments (including 1 from the applicant) summarised as follows:</u> (a) well designed, (b) improved landscaping for ecology, and (c) good use of brownfield site.		
Parish Council:	<u>Comments 12 July 2023:</u> No objection <u>Comments 25 January 2023:</u> Object – the developer appears to have disregarded the advice of the Winchester & Eastleigh Design Review Panel which sought to retain the traditional appearance of the barns.		
EBC Conservationist:	<u>Comments 10 July 2023</u> The modern materials have been changed to traditional ones completely in keeping with the listed buildings and therefore complementing them to achieve a wholesome setting for these heritage assets combined with a plan revision more relevant to the site. Holding objection withdrawn. <u>Comments 27 January 2023</u> Holding objection. Context. This almost complete farmstead contains three individually listed buildings in addition to curtilage buildings and some modern additions which detract from the original therefore causing harm to their setting. Formerly all were in the same ownership but the main farmhouse, currently on the market, is not part of this application site but does however still form part of the setting. The listed structures are The Farmhouse, the main barn and the granary. Although having suffered various changes over the centuries as agricultural fortunes have ebbed and flowed, the main bones of the steading remain in easily recognizable form and in reasonable condition. The ground is clay, so not too easy to work, and has lately just been used for cattle grazing, hence the modern farm building to the rear as the older ones were unsuitable, being small and horse friendly rather than tractor friendly. From an agricultural viewpoint these original farm buildings are past their useful life in terms of size, layout and efficient use. Built when everything was done by hand and horse, both building and		

	technology have moved a long way forward, considerably reducing the amount of human involvement. Combined with the apparent need to provide more housing and using this lower grade land for it, which is the logical answer, the original purpose of these buildings evaporates. The Proposal. This is the fifth iteration of a scheme for this site, none as successful as the original, I'm afraid. The use of zinc roofing so close to the two listed buildings on the public front in the original farmyard ruin the setting of not only these two buildings but the whole aura of the historical farmyard and are not appropriate in this position. The proposed new housing to the east and south of the existing farmyard is in stark contrast to the original and of its time, so there will be no confusion. It is more appropriate than the existing barn F and individually the units are of lesser volume, so of less impact. Conclusion I cannot accept that the use of zinc roofing in the existing farmyard is a step forward and feel it is injurious to the setting of the listed buildings in this context.
EBC Urban Design & Landscape:	<u>Comments 28 July 2023</u> No objection in principle. Further suggestions: It would be encouraged to reduce even further the ridge height of Plot 5 single storey extension and Plot 4 car barn. Concern of overlooking from Plot 1 towards Barn B. Concern of loss of outlook proposed to the new dwelling and how to restrict Barn Bs private garden. Further information with regard to bin and cycle storage. External layout/ height/ form/ scale & mass: The proposals have positively evolved to address the concerns raised by DRP and EBC officers, in terms of layout, massing and architecture style. The amended scheme better reflects the layout of a farmstead with a clear central yard surrounded by an arrangement of simple linked building forms. The design of the proposed dwellings is an improvement in terms of architectural style and external materials, as it blends better with the existing barns, showing a simpler and more rational approach. It is welcomed that the proposed dwellings are predominantly single storey in scale, with some first-floor accommodation in roofs, and a few far more modest two storey dwellings. More consideration has been given with regard to enclosure by making some of the proposed dwellings terraced more akin to a barn. The proposed arrangement offers more enclosure when compared to the previous iteration and consequently gives a great impression of a yard. The arrangement of Plot 1 is welcomed, as it provides a better end vista. The current scheme is more sympathetic in scale, form and layout as well as reflecting the more modest and functional agricultural nature of the existing farm. External appearance & materials: The simple palette of materials responds to the agricultural history and setting of the site.

	Samples of all proposed materials will be required given the heritage significance of this site.
Design Review Panel:	The Panel noted the inclusion of the existing farmstead buildings and acknowledged the importance of considering the development as a whole. In general terms there was no objection of concern in relation to the conversion of the existing buildings, but the Panel would recommend the proposals are reviewed in more detail by the Council's Conservation Officer. The new layout to reflect the idea of a new farmyard was welcomed in principle. However, the detached buildings and multiple changes from single to two storey scale and pitched to flat roof forms lacked the physical enclosure required to successfully give the impression of a yard in the same manner as the existing farmstead. Concern was also expressed at the scale and form of the proposed new dwellings, which have a very urban two storey scale with high steeply pitched roofs which result from the deep and wide building footprints. The height and bulk is in stark contrast to the generally modest single storey scale of the existing farmstead buildings. Even the large listed threshing barn, whilst having a higher ridgeline, has low eaves which gives a more modest scale (despite being the largest original farmstead structure). Any new development needs to acknowledge the threshing barn and be subservient so as not to detract from the importance of this barn. The proposed dwellings compete with the threshing barn in terms of physical dominance. Consideration should be given to making some of the proposed dwellings attached or terraced more akin to a barn which would be more linear, with simple roof forms and long unbroken ridges and low unbroken eaves. The proposed dwellings, whilst individually designed, there was nothing to suggest or demonstrate that they had been specifically designed for this site or their particular part of the site (to take advantage of orientation/ views etc). Whilst in principle there was no objection to a more contemporary design style of use of materials the proposals were not considered to sit comfortably with the existing structures, being too harsh in terms of their form and use of materials in comparison to the softer more organic character of the existing. Also noted was the proposed use of gravel surfacing for existing and proposed yard areas. Historically farmyards would have been surfaced in a solid material (cobbles/ pavements/ bricks etc), whilst not significant it will impact the authenticity of the original yard in particular. In principle the Panel had no objection to the construction of further dwellings and were in agreement that there are better options than that allowed as part of the existing prior approval. However, any new development needs to follow the idea of being part of the natural organic evolution and expansion of the original farmstead.
EBC Arboriculturalist:	<u>Comments 26 July 2023</u> Agreeable to the updated information <u>Comments 4 July 2023</u> No issues with the proposed changes, but it appears that the tree protection fencing position may be in conflict with Unit 2. Updated tree protection plan required. <u>Comments 5 May 2023 (following updated reports)</u>

	I can confirm that we are happy with the report and would like to condition the report's compliance. <u>Comments 22 March 2023 (following additional information received 17 February 2023)</u> They are proposing to remove one of the large oaks that I had concerns over. I am broadly supportive of this proposal as the tree isn't in particularly good condition, however, they will have to demonstrate suitable replacement planting within the redline. <u>Comments 9 February 2023</u> Holding objection: We have concerns regarding the relationship between the oak trees that make up group TG2 and units 3 and 4. Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing barn (barn F) is in close proximity to the crowns of these trees, and that permission has been granted to convert this barn, this application relates to "normal" residential units and we have concerns regarding the above ground relationship (dominance and shading of residential amenity space) and risk to future residents (alteration of the occupancy and land use). Both of these impacts could result in pressure to prune or remove. As it stands, additional information is requested on this area in particular. For example, the 3 oaks have been grouped together, but that makes it harder to assess their individual impact – the trees are of varying quality and position, which inhibits individual assessment. As such, we raise a holding objection and request that these three oak are reassessed as individuals, paying particular attention to their individual quality and crown spreads.
EBC Ecology:	<u>Comments 25 April 2023</u> Biodiversity enhancements required (including in the form of bat bricks/ swift nests). Site plan shows green roofs, and informal planting in gravel (which is marked as lavender). I am satisfied that new bat surveys are not likely to yield different results from the 2021 bat survey data and the 2018 survey data, and that the survey results were in date when the report was written, however as shown by the differences between the 2018 and 2021 survey results, bats do move around. The bat license method statement will include ecological supervision during renovations and should also include a plan of precautions to be taken in case another bat roost is found in a new location. If there was suitable nesting habitat for barn owls in Building B, a barn owl nest box should be provided as replacement habitat. The letter states that any trees to be removed will be subject to a Preliminary Roost Assessment (RPA) prior to removal, followed by any further survey works (if required). These trees must be assessed at the correct time of year so that if further survey is required it can be done within the active bat season. <u>Comments 23 February 2023 (following additional information received 22 February 2023)</u> I have read the letter from Ecosupport (22 February 2023) which addresses most of my concerns. <u>Comments 26 January 2023</u> I am concerned with regards to the increase in housing density (5 additional dwellings) proposed by these new applications and

	how the layout differs from the previous applications... particularly with regards to accommodation for the important bat roosts found on site, which include roosts of local and county significance. I have reviewed the updated planning statement by Hurrell Architecture Ltd (December 2022). In Section 2 this states that the previous application did not include redevelopment of Barn F, prior approval was granted for the conversion into 5 new dwellings, and ...The farm comprises a number of farm buildings with 2 of the buildings being Grade 2 listed, Granary Barn E and Barn B. In Section 3 it states that Barn E has Prior approval for: Prior notification for a change of use of Agricultural buildings to 5no. Dwelling houses and building operations reasonably necessary for the conversion. The Ecological Appraisal lists Building A: a common pipistrelle day roost, Building B: a common pipistrelle day roost, a brown long eared bat maternity roost, Serotine, soprano pipistrelle and Natterers day roosts Building C: a common pipistrelle day roost, a brown long eared bat satellite roost Building D: a common Pipistrelle maternity roost, a historic brown long eared bat satellite roost, and a historic soprano pipistrelle day roost Building E: a common pipistrelle day roost Building F: has been assessed as having negligible bat roost potential and no evidence of bat occupation or feeding was identified. The report later states (in 4.3.5.1) that there will be a loss of internal foraging opportunities for bats within buildings B, C and F. Therefore, the loss of building F would not necessarily be negligible. The latest bat surveys were done between May and July of 2021 and are now out of date as they were only guaranteed for 18 months. Since building F was not part of the earlier application, bat activity around this building was not recorded. The report states that there will be a loss of internal foraging opportunities for bats within buildings B, C and F. What is proposed to replace this foraging habitat? Potential for breeding and nesting birds was addressed in section 4.7.2 but a building which has suitable nesting habitat for barn owls was listed as building 2, rather than one of the letter designations now being used. Any works done on buildings A-E would require a bat license from Natural England and be carried out under the supervision of a bat-licensed ecologist. The report recommends that works avoid the bat hibernation period, November through February and the bat maternity period mid- May and mid- September. Work schedules would have to be planned to avoid these seasons on the relevant buildings and areas around these buildings. Construction lighting must be avoided at night or very tightly controlled so as not to add additional light to any of the areas used for roosting, foraging or commuting bats. Additional biodiversity features must be added to the buildings proposed to replace barn F. Any trees that would be impacted by this updated scheme will need to be checked for potential bat roost features as this was not done previously (stated in Ecological Assessment, 4.3.2). Surface water drainage proposals must be updated to match the new proposed layout.
EBC Environmental Health:	Noise: Located approx. 60m back from Mortimers Lane and behind existing dwellings the risk of noise impact to the internal living environment and outdoor amenity would ordinarily be approximately low for lightly trafficked road. We do not have a noise survey to refer to in the application documents provided by the applicant and consequently exposure to average daytime and

	night time noise levels, as well as instantaneous noise levels is not known. For a traditionally built dwelling we would ordinarily have a reasonable estimation of the sound insulation the building envelope will provide. In the case of the proposed dwellings within a converted agriculture building we do not. The designer will need to know the sound insulation required of the building envelope elements and therefore a noise survey and acoustic calculation is necessary for this. If windows and doors need to be closed to prevent noise intrusion, mechanical ventilation and means of preventing over hearing are needed. We do not object to the application but require a condition for noise impact assessment and acoustic design. Malodour: The proposals will supersede animal husbandry and therefore any malodour present now will not exist during occupation. Contaminated Land conditions required.
EBC Countryside:	None received.
Environment Agency:	None received.
Natural England:	<u>Comments 9 May 2023:</u> No objection – subject to appropriate mitigation being secured. <u>Comments 3 February 2023:</u> Further information required.
HCC Flooding:	None received.
HCC Highways:	<u>Comments 17 July 2023:</u> No objection, subject to conditions. Previously concerns were raised with the availability of space for the movement of fire tender to access the southern end of the site, an updated vehicle tracking drawing has been received. Drawing “5880/204 Rev A” demonstrates that the movement is achievable and therefore there are no longer any concerns in this regard. A request for updated refuse vehicle tracking was also made, however it is noted that the updates to the site layout shown in drawing 991-D-008 Rev B do not actually affect the layout within which a refuse vehicle will turn and access the bin collection point shown. As such, there is indeed no requirement for an updated refuse vehicle track to be provided. <u>Comments 11 July 2023:</u> The site layout plans have been updated. The changes primarily relate to the dwelling layout on the south and east boundaries. This has been assessed, and whilst there appears to be adequate space allowed for the turning of vehicles the turning head area outside of units 2 through to 5, is unclear whether adequate space is afforded for fire tender or refuse vehicle access, round the corner of revised unit 1. The relocated position of unit 1 has significantly restrained the vehicle access width between it and Barn B, as such would be requested that vehicle tracking be shown. <u>Comments 28 February 2023:</u> Following additional information, no objection is raised from a highways perspective, subject to conditions.

Access:
CAD AutoTrack drawings have been received to demonstrate two-way movements at the existing access points taken from Mortimers Lane. These are acceptable and demonstrate that the movements are achievable without the potential need for a vehicle to have to wait on Mortimers lane whilst another vehicle exits site. in terms of pedestrian access, plans have now been submitted showing the proposed link from the development site to the existing footway network. This is accepted in principle, however a condition would be requested (should permission be granted) to ensure the footway is built prior to occupation of the site. It should also be noted by the applicants that the footway (once approved) will need to be constructed via a S278 agreement for works on the highway, details of which can be found via the following link:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/section-278>

Servicing:
in regard to servicing of the site, again CAD Autotracking drawings have been provided which demonstrate that there is adequate space on-site for the movement of servicing vehicles. As previously outlined however, it would also be recommended that the Case Officer liaises with the EBC Direct Services Team, to ensure that arrangements are acceptable for the collection of waste.

Developer Contributions:
As outlined in the original consultation response, whilst no highway developer contributions are required, a contribution of £6k is requested for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) associated with the development, is requested. This would primarily be for parking restrictions to prevent parking in the access junction and along the frontage on Mortimers Lane.

Subject to conditions requiring a construction method statement and footway construction provision.

Comments 1 February 2023:

Whilst no objection is principle, additional information would be required.

Access:
Vehicle access into the site is proposed to be via the existing access points taken from Mortimers lane, and this is acceptable in principle. However, given the flow of traffic at these access points will be two-way, it is requested that CAD AutoTrack drawings are submitted to demonstrate how this movement is achievable without a vehicle having to wait on Mortimers Lane, whilst another vehicle exits site. in terms of pedestrian access, whilst the submitted Design Statement outlines how previous applications provided a footway to link the site into the existing footway provision to the west, and indeed the footway provision is mentioned in the current application description, it appears to be missing from plans. As such, plans should be updated to show this provisions so that it can be assessed for suitability accordingly, and also be added as a condition of planning should the application gain a permission. It should also be noted by the applicants that the footway (once approved) will need to be

	constructed via a S278 agreement for works on the highway, details of which can be found via the following link: https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/section-278 Servicing: In regard to servicing of the site, particularly refuse collections (and emergency vehicle access), it is noted that the Design Statement outlines that 'the site will provide access for refuse and emergency vehicles within the site'. However, no vehicle tracking drawings have been submitted as part of the application to demonstrate if these movements are actually achievable. As such, it is requested that appropriate CAD AutoTrack drawings are submitted, which should show movement of refuse and emergency vehicles (fire tender) around the site and also through the site access junction. It would also be recommended that the Case Officer liaises with the EBC Direct Services Team, to ensure that arrangements are acceptable for the collection of waste, and that adequate space to manoeuvre vehicles on site is provided. Parking: Whilst the quantum for on-site parking is for EBC to assess in their role as Local Parking Authority, in terms of layout this has been reviewed and is of an acceptable design with adequately sized parking bays, step out strips provided when the space is located adjacent to landscaping or vertical obstructions, and correctly sized aisle widths to allow for ease of turning movements. Developer Contributions: Whilst no highway developer contributions are required, a contribution of £6k is requested for Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) associated with the development, is requested. This would primarily be for parking restrictions to prevent parking in the access junction and along the frontage on Mortimers Lane. Subject to conditions requiring a construction method statement and footway construction provision.
Southampton Airport:	We have no objection to this proposal.

Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

Policies: S1 (sustainable development), S2 (approach to development), S3 (location of new housing), S5 (New development in the countryside), S8 (Historic environment), DM1 (general development), DM2 (environmentally sustainable development), DM3 (climate change), DM6 (surface water management), DM8 (pollution), DM11 (nature conservation), DM12 (Heritage assets), DM13 (access), DM14 (parking), DM30 (internal space standards), and DM38 (funding infrastructure).

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Site Visit

Yes ☒

No ☐

28 February 2023.

Assessment:

Site & Surroundings

The application site comprises a farmstead to the south of Mortimers Lane (B3037). There are 6 barns on site, with 1no. building to the east and west of the application site, and is accessed via the same route situated to the west of 'The Lodge'.

There are several buildings on the site, 2 of which are Listed Buildings. There is also a Listed Building adjacent the site, below are the 3no. Grade II Listed Buildings and their respective descriptions by Historic England:

Mortimers Farmhouse (adjacent the site): *A traditional group of buildings. House of C17, C18, of 2 storeys. Interior shows old framework, partly exposed on upper east gable; external finish is in brickwork, English bond (red with many blue headers) partly painted, also some Flemish Garden Wall bond. Massive red tile roof with central stack, half-hips at end, tied in at west by gabled cross unit. Casements. At some time 2 dwellings.*

Main/ Threshing Barn (Barn B): *C18. Barn with red tile roof, half-hipped, central doorway, weatherboard, interior having typical double aisled sections, of 5 bays with narrower end bays.*

Granary (Barn E): *C18. Granary on 9 staddle stones, red tile pyramid roof; weatherboarded.*

The site and wider surroundings also fall within the designated countryside. Views from the southern and eastern parts of the site allow glimpses of East Horton golf course.

Proposal

The application proposes alterations, extensions and conversion of 4 existing barns (including Grade II Listed Threshing Barn (Barn B) and Granary) to create 4 dwellings, and the demolition of modern barn and construction of 5no. new dwellings. The application also proposes new sewerage and a footpath on the southern side of Mortimers Lane.

Barn A

Currently this Barn has an 'L-shaped' footprint of approx. 178m². The application proposes to increase the height, in part, to measure a maximum of 6.3m. There would be an array of pitched roof heights (the garage element would measure approx. 5.2m and the habitable bedrooms/ bathroom element would measure approx. 4.8m in height). The tallest element would incorporate 1no. dormer on the southern elevation, fronting the central courtyard. The overall ground floor footprint would be approx. 220m².

Barn B (Grade II Listed Building)

This currently has a footprint of 208m². The application proposes to increase this (by including an angled single storey extension) resulting in a ground floor footprint of approx. 224m². At first floor, there would be 2no. bedrooms, separated by a central bat loft. The overall height of the building would measure approx. 8.7m, with an array of eaves heights. This would have a central porch measuring approx. 6.5m in height.

Barn C

This proposes a footprint of approx. 83.9m², which would have a barn hipped roof with an overall height of approx. 7.3m and eaves which would measure approx. 3.4m. There would be an attached car port to the northern elevation which would have a mono-pitched roof with a maximum height of 4.7m and eaves height of approx. 1.9m.

Barn D

This proposes a rectangular footprint of approx. 156m². This would have a couple of different pitched roof heights of approx. 6.3m and 5m, with eaves which would measure approx. 3m and 2.7m (respectively). There would also be a front dormer, currently the front dormer is rectangular with a flat roof and consumes the majority of the roof slope. Whereby the proposed dormer would be located centrally, projecting approx. 2.3m from the roof slope with a pitched roof which would measure approx. 3m in height and eaves which would measure approx. 1.5m.

Barn E (Grade II Listed Building):

The existing barn has a footprint of approx. 25m², with a hipped roof with a maximum height of 4.5m and eaves height of 2.4m. The building is raised above ground by approx. 0.6m. The application seeks to 'make good' of the existing barn. The footprint and dimensions would remain unchanged.

Barn F/ 5no. dwellings

Plot 1:

This would have a footprint of approx. 126m², with a barn hipped roof which would have a maximum height of 7.7m and eaves which would measure approx. 4m. This would include a single storey garage which would project 3m to the east with a mono-pitched roof with a maximum height of 5m, and a single storey rear extension which would project 5.2m to the south with a hipped roof with a maximum height of 4.9m. The northern elevation would have a porch positioned centrally at ground floor with 2no. pitched roof eaves dormers.

Plots 2 – 4:

Starting with the footprints, Plot 2 would measure approx. 84.8m², Plot 3 would measure approx. 82m² and Plot 4 would measure approx. 113.9m². These would form a terraced group with a shared pitched roof which would have a maximum height of 7.1m and eaves which would measure 3.7m. On the western roof slope, there would be 3no. dormers (1no. on Plot 2, and 2no. on Plot 4). To the north of the terrace (Plot 2) and west of Plot 4 there are attached carports, which would have pitched roofs with a maximum height of 5m.

Plot 5:

This would have a footprint of approx. 168m², with a pitched roof which would have a maximum height of 7.3m and eaves which would measure approx. 4m. This would have 2no. single storey extensions, one would project 6.8m to the east and the other would project 10.5m to the north. This dwelling would also incorporate 1no. pitched roof eaves dormer to the north.

The proposals would be finished in a combination of: red brick, clay roof tiles, dark stained timber cladding and anthracite aluminium fenestration.

The proposals also include sewerage works, and the construction of a new pedestrian access from the application site, along the southern side of Mortimers Lane to connect to the development to Pembers Hill development, which ultimately adjoins Knowle Lane.

Principle

The application site falls within designated countryside protected by Policy S5. This Policy sets out that new development in the countryside is generally restricted and notes (1) compatible usages for which new development in the countryside is appropriate. The Policy also goes on to note (2) that new development in the countryside *will seek to avoid*

adverse impacts upon the intrinsic character of the landscape. The addition of residential development within the countryside is not included within the compatible usages. However, in this specific instance planning application PN/21/90993 granted prior approval for the conversion of existing Barn F into 5no. residential units, under agricultural conversion (Class Q of the GPDO). The proposals, as part of this application, would seek the demolition of the existing Barn F and erection of 5no. separate dwellinghouses. As a result of the history of the site, with the previous prior approval granting residential development and that the proposals would not result in a net increase in residential, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in principle.

In addition to the countryside location, there are also 3no. Listed Buildings on/adjacent to the site, these comprise; The Farmhouse, the Main Barn (Barn B) and the Granary (Barn E), thus engaging Policies S8 and DM12. These policies seek to ensure that development does not have an adverse impact upon protected heritage assets and would only be permitted where the proposals do not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the asset.

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF relates to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with sub-paragraph d) ii) relating to the decision-taking process, noting that permission should be granted unless *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole*. Paragraph 14 elaborates on this stating that where the application involves the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development would be assessed against the criteria laid out (a-d).

Given that the prior approval application allows the introduction of 5no. residential units, the proposals to demolish the existing Barn F and erect 5no. separate dwellings would be considered acceptable in principle, however, would be subject to the following considerations set out within this report.

Design & Impact upon Heritage Assets

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of the surrounding areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbouring, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design and siting. Policy DM12 stipulates that development of a heritage asset would only be permitted where the proposals do not harm or detract from the significance or special interest of the asset.

Section 66 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), states that "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State 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."

Previously applications F/21/91137 & L/21/91145 permitted the conversions of existing Barns A-D and E. This current application seeks to alter the previously approved scheme. The differences comprise:

- Barn A: has more active elevations with additional/ better proportioned fenestration and the addition of a dormer on the southern elevation
- Barn B: externally, this is similar to that previously approved, given its historic importance. There has, however, been the introduction of additional, appropriate, fenestration. Internally there has been the creation of a first floor for 2no. bedrooms served by en-suites and separate staircases
- Barn C: has better proportioned fenestration

- Barn D: has better proportioned fenestration and central dormer on the eastern roofslope
- Barn E: is similar to that previously approved, as it is also Listed

Prior approval PN/21/90993 granted the conversion of agricultural Barn F into 5no. residential units. This application seeks the removal of Barn F and its replacement with 5no. separate dwellings, in an amended layout. Whereby, it should be noted that the application has been through DRP which aided the amendments to the plans.

Starting with the layout, Barns A, B, C, D & E are all roughly situated around a central green which was formerly used for animals. The amended plans now show Listed Barn B to be the central/ focal point of the development, also allowing this a larger external amenity area. The new dwellings have been repositioned, Plot 1 would be to the east of Barn B, visible from Mortimers Lane, thereby its most active elevation has been orientated north. With the separation distance between Barn B allowing for vehicular movement through this new addition of the site. Plots 2-4 create an angled terrace/ akin to 'workers cottages'. Plot 5 has been tucked comfortably within the south-western corner, allowing for greater space around Barn B.

The elevations/ appearance of the proposed dwellings (Plots 1-5) have also been amended during the process. Plot 1 is a farmhouse cottage style, with 2no. eaves dormers and central porch, which would be visible from Mortimers Lane. Plots 2-4 create workers cottages in terms of their style with a couple of flat roofed dormers on either ends of the terrace. Plot 5 is, again, different in character to Plots 1-4. This seeks to reflect similar aesthetics to Barns A and D. Whilst the new dwellings have a couple of different styles, there are some similarities with the existing barns. The variance of design is considered to provide visual interest, whilst still respecting the countryside setting and heritage assets. The proposals would also be tied by a simple material palette which has been deduced by amended plans, creating cohesion and fluidity throughout the existing and proposed development.

Originally the Council's Conservation Officer raised some concern with the introduction of new materials (namely zinc roofing). The materials have since been amended and comprise a simple material palette across the existing and proposed development. This aids the cohesion and authenticity of the farmstead and new additions. The materials are recommended to be secured via condition to ensure that a high quality appearance is achieved.

Turning to the heritage assets, Barns B & E. Barn B has previously received permission to be converted into a residential use. This permission included both internal and external alterations. The proposals under this current application have broadly kept the externals similar to that previously approved. There have, however, been amendments as the Council's Conservationist was not agreeable to the use of some materials (namely zinc). As such, the materials have been amended and simplified, which are recommended to be secured via condition. Further, there has been the creation of a first floor, following close consultation with the Council's Ecologist, whereby the first floor still allows space for a bat loft. These alterations to the building itself, following amendments, are considered to be acceptable and would conserve this heritage asset. It should also be noted that the scheme has been amended in terms of its layout, whereby the additional 5no. dwellings have been centred around Barn B, thus this is considered to be the focal point of the development as a whole, which in turn demonstrates respect and subservience to the important heritage asset. Barn E previously received permission to be converted and made good. The proposals within this application are similar to the previous and therefore are considered improve the existing appearance and state of the Barn.

The application also proposes the provision of a footpath along the southern side of Mortimers Lane, this will be discussed further within the highways section, and is recommended to be secured via condition

To conclude, the proposals to the listed building themselves are not considered to result in adverse harm, nor are the proposals within the curtilage of the listed buildings considered to result in harm. All the proposals would conserve, and in some instances (namely works to Barn E) enhance the listed buildings and their setting. The proposals are therefore not considered to result in harm to the listed building, thus would not engage Paragraphs 199-203 of the NPPF. The proposals are also considered to be acceptable, in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

Internal & External Space for Future Occupiers

To ensure adequate internal living standards are met the Local Planning Authority assess the measurements of space against the 'Nationally Described Space Standards' (NDSS) (March 2015). Policy DM30 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires that all new dwellings meet the NDSS as a minimum. In addition to internal arrangements, the Quality Places SPD requires all new residential development to provide a garden area of 60% of the host dwellinghouse.

The NDSS sets out the minimum space required for new dwellinghouses, this is dependent upon the number of bedrooms, people who would reside there and storeys. There are also standards relating to sizes of bedrooms; a single occupancy bedroom should measure 7.5m², and a double occupancy bedroom should measure 11.5m².

The application proposes:

- 4no. two-storey 3no. bedroom dwelling, whereby the NDSS requires between 84m² – 102m²
- 4no. two-storey 4no. bedroom dwellings, whereby the NDSS requires between 97m² - 124m²

(units m ²)	Overall Floor-space	Bedroom 1	Bedroom 2	Bedroom 3	Bedroom 4
Barn A	214	30.8(en-suite)	20.4(en-suite)	11.9 (bed 05)	10.3
Barn B	276	22 (en-suite)	16.7 (en-suite)	15	12.3
Barn C	113	21	11.2	8.6	-
Barn D	160	19 (en-suite)	14.3 (en-suite)	11.6 (en-suite)	8.7 (study)
Plot 1	160	13.3 (en-suite)	11.2	9.7	10
Plot 2	130	14.7 (en-suite)	11	11	-
Plot 3	130	15 (en-suite)	10.9	10.9	-
Plot 4	155	15.3 (en-suite)	11	10.9	-
Plot 5	180	12.4 (en-suite)	10.9	8.7	8.5

All dwellings exceed the minimum space standards (set out above), and all bedrooms, as a minimum, exceed single person occupancy. Within Barn D bedroom 4 is annotated as a study, however it is noted that this is big enough for a single occupancy room. Further, from the submitted floor plans and elevations, it appears that each habitable room would be served by a window, thus would provide adequate natural light and outlook.

In addition, and as set out within the Council's Quality Places SPD, the garden size for new residential development must be at least 60% of the floor space of the host dwellinghouse.

	Garden Size	Size Percentage (60)%	Compliant
Barn A	180m ²	128	Yes
Barn B	759m ²	165	Yes
Barn C	132m ²	67.8	Yes
Barn D	75m ²	96	Yes

Plot 1	199m ²	96	Yes
Plot 2	237m ²	78	Yes
Plot 3	138m ²	78	Yes
Plot 4	382m ²	93	Yes
Plot 5	254m ²	108	Yes

Further to the above space standards, the Council's Environmental Health Team have been consulted upon. They made comments in relation to noise, and recommended a condition be imposed. The proposals would be situated to the south of Mortimers Lane. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is a busy and potentially noisy road, the dwellings would be set in from the northern boundary. Barn A has been set in further south, than that previously approved (as a result of a drain pipe). The siting and separation of Barn A to Mortimers Lane is therefore comparable to The Lodge (located to the east of the site), which is an existing dwelling. As such, it is not considered necessary to condition noise mitigations for Barn A. The other Barn conversions and introduction of 5no. dwellings are situated further south of Mortimers Lane and would therefore be impacted less.

To conclude, the proposals would provide satisfactory internal and external living standards, and would therefore be acceptable in this regard.

Impact upon Neighbouring Amenities

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulates that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

Due to the location and siting of the proposals, within the countryside, there are no nearby neighbouring amenities which would be adversely impacted upon.

To the west of the application site is Mortimers Farmhouse. This is set to the western portion of its site, with the access along the shared boundary with the application site. Barns C, D & E, are the closest buildings to this neighbour, and whilst they would be altered externally and converted, they are not considered to result in a harmful impact upon this neighbour due to the scale/ nature of the proposed external works, combined with the existing separation distance.

The Lodge, situated to the east of the application site, shares the same access from Mortimers Lane. The existing Barns A-E and Barn F all currently utilise this shared access. The locations of Barns A-E remain unchanged and therefore would not impact this neighbour. There would however, be the removal of Barn F and creation of 5no. separate dwellings, these have been laid out so as not to have an adverse impact upon this neighbour. Plot 1 would be situated to the south of The Lodge, at an angle so as not to result in an overbearing impact or any adverse overlooking. The proposals are therefore not considered to have a harmful impact upon this neighbour.

The Council's Urban Design Officer made comments with regard to the potential overlooking from the first floor windows on the western elevation of Plot 1 to Barn B and the potential loss of privacy for the rear garden of Barn B. Plot 1 is positioned at an oblique angle so that there would be limited views of Barn B's 'kitchen garden'. Further, the windows at first floor level on Barn B would not align with Plot 1 and therefore there would not be any inter-overlooking. Due to the siting arrangements of Plots 2-5 there could be potential for the first floor windows facing into the site to overlook the rear garden of Barn B. All of the windows at first floor facing into the site facilitate bedrooms, and would be served by modest dormer windows or rooflights, which are not considered to provide unacceptable views. Furthermore, there is a landscaping scheme recommended to be secured via condition, therefore there is the opportunity to enhance landscaping in and around Barn B to mitigate perceived overlooking.

To conclude, the proposals are not considered to have an adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and would therefore be acceptable, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

Highway Safety, Parking & Refuse Storage

Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires that development is or could be well served by public transport, cycling and walking and it includes measures which minimise its impact on the existing highway network. Policy DM14 of the same Plan requires that an appropriate level of car parking be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards. The policy provisions are consistent with the requirements of the NPPF and in particular those of paragraphs 107 and 108.

Due to the nature of the proposals, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been consulted, originally they requested additional information with regard to access and servicing. They also requested developer contribution monies and a condition relating to the footway construction provision (a footway connecting the site to Knowle Lane, some 460m west).

Following the request for additional information, amended plans relating to access and servicing were provided, whereby the LHA have raised no concern. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard.

It is noted that the LHA requested developer contribution monies. The proposed scheme is not of a size to warrant having to pay these financial contributions, and therefore in this instance would not be required.

A Transport Statement was submitted to support this application, which shows the proposed footpath to the southern side of Mortimers Lane. This footpath was requested by the LHA, which the applicant has agreed to provide and has shown on plan referenced "991-D-007 Rev A". The finer details of this element will be secured via a S278 Agreement with the LHA.

Turning to parking, Barns A and B, and Plots 1 and 5 all have 4no. bedrooms thus requiring 3no. off-street parking provisions. These are provided in the form of carports and hard standing. Barn D has 3no. bedrooms and a study which could be used as a bedroom. This has hardstanding for 2no. off-street parking provisions to the north of the building. Barn C, and Plots 2-4 all have 3no. bedrooms thus requiring 2no. off-street parking provisions, which are provided in the form of carports and hard standing. The proposals therefore provide policy compliant parking provisions for the proposed residential units. Furthermore, visitor parking is provided to the west of Barn B, which is considered acceptable.

As such, and to conclude the proposals are considered to be acceptable, in accordance with DM13 and DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

Ecology & Trees

Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.

The Council's Ecologist has been consulted as part of this application; they raised concern with regard to introduction of new dwellings. The submitted ecology report notes that Barns A-E have bat roost features, Barn F was assessed as having negligible bat roost

potential, and no evidence of bats were found. Later in the report, it was noted that there *will be a loss of internal foraging opportunities for bats within buildings B, C and F. Therefore, the loss of building F would not necessarily be negligible.* The latest bat surveys were done between May and July of 2021 and are now out of date as they were only guaranteed for 18 months. Further, Barn F was not part of the previous planning applications therefore this would need to be fully addressed, and measures of replacement foraging habitat. In addition, any trees which would be impacted by the proposals would need to be checked for potential bat roost features. Following the receipt of additional information, the Council's Ecologist noted that new bat surveys are not likely to yield different results from the 2021 bat survey data and the 2018 survey data. It was also noted that any works done on buildings A-E would require a bat license from Natural England and be carried out under the supervision of a bat-licensed ecologist. The report also recommends that works avoid the bat hibernation period (November through February) and the bat maternity period (mid-May and mid-September). If there was suitable nesting habitat for barn owls in Building B, a barn owl nest box should be provided as replacement habitat. The supporting letter also states that any trees to be removed will be subject to a Preliminary Roost Assessment (RPA) prior to removal, followed by any further survey works (if required). Any construction lighting would also need to be controlled, and additional biodiversity features are required. It is considered that all these matters can all be secured via condition.

The Council's Arboriculturalist originally raised concerns with regard to the relationship between the oak trees and residential development, noting that this would place additional pressure to prune or remove the trees. Following additional information it was proposed to remove a tree. The Council's Arboriculturalist was supportive of the proposals however requested additional information to support the removal of the tree and to demonstrate replacement planting was achievable within the site. Following the receipt of additional information the Council's Arboriculturalist was agreeable and requested a condition be imposed, ensuring that development accords with the arboricultural report (including tree protection measures). Additional planting is also recommended to be secured within the wider landscaping condition, as such, and subject to conditions, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Drainage

Policies DM3 and DM6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulate that new development must provide sustainable drainage systems (SuDs) wherever feasible, naturalised filtration should also be included.

The Council's Ecologist requested surface water drainage plans to be to reflect the new proposed layout. Further plans and details relating to drainage (surface and foul) are recommended to be secured via condition.

Contaminated Land

Policy DM8 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that development will not be permitted if it is likely to cause loss of amenity of impact upon public health or other unacceptable environmental impacts; including land contamination.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer was consulted, whereby they noted that subject to conditions, the proposals would be acceptable. These are therefore recommended to be imposed.

Sustainability

Policy DM2 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires new development to provide a 19% improvement in predicted carbon emissions, and water consumption standards of 110L per person per day.

The proposals do not provide any sustainability measures. It is therefore recommended that sustainability measures be secured via condition.

SPA Mitigations

The Council, as the responsible body for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), must ensure as part of a planning application that a development will not have an adverse impact upon any European protected sites, and specifically in this case, the European protected Solent Complex (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites), River Itchen (SAC) and New Forest National Park (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites). It is recognised that the addition of residential development would have an adverse impact upon the surrounding designated European protected sites.

Due to the nature of the proposals, a HRA was undertaken and submitted to Natural England for their review, whereby no objection was raised, subject to securing appropriate mitigations.

The Solent & Southampton Water Special Protection Area is an internationally designated conservation site and is protected for its overwintering birds. It is recognised that new house building (within a 5.6km buffer of the designated area) is placing increased pressure on these overwintering birds from more people visiting the coastline. As such the Council requires all housing developments within the buffer to make a financial contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy, which aims to limit recreational disturbance to our coastline through careful management. The application site does not fall within the 5.6m buffer and therefore this monetary mitigation would not be applicable.

In terms of water quality, Natural England have advised that new housing development should achieve nutrient neutrality in order to mitigate the impacts of additional nitrogen arising from the sewage generated by the future residents. This wastewater then feeds into the Solent Complex via Waste-Water Treatment Works which discharges into the river network and so causes eutrophication affecting the features for which it is designated. The Council has adopted its own strategy for achieving nutrient neutrality whereby it identifies areas of agricultural land and remove these from a nitrate intensive use, thus reducing the nitrogen input into the protected sites, with the level of reduction then being used as a means of offsetting the impacts of development proposals within the Borough. This ensures no overall net increase in nitrates within the Solent and thereby allow a development to achieve nutrient neutrality. In order to do this, the Council calculates the level of nitrate mitigation this land provides (measured in kg) and makes 'nitrate credits' available to developers to buy, with funding being secured during the planning application. The HRA covered that the proposal would result in an additional 19.68kgTN/year, and that the necessary mitigation monies would be secured via condition.

Furthermore, Natural England has also recently raised concern with regard to additional residential development within 13.8km radius of the New Forest. This is considered to have an adverse impact upon the New Forest by way of additional trips resulting in further recreational disturbance. The application site does not fall within the 13.8km buffer and therefore mitigation would not be applicable.

Other Matters

In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Pre-commencement Conditions) Regulations 2018, the Local Planning Authority informed the agent of the pre-commencement conditions to which they confirmed they were agreeable (email dated 5 September 2023).

Equalities Act:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2021 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020-2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF and development plan do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and Local Plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Local Plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

The NPPF aims for the need for housing to be met, and Policy S2 of the Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. The NPPF and Policies, S1, DM2, and DM3 of the Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change and is expected to limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

Conclusion:

The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐