

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/26/101714

Site Address: OLD GRANGE FARM, GRANGE ROAD, BURSLEDON,
SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 8GD

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: Conversion of existing stables to 1.no 2-bedroom dwelling with associated curtilage and parking. Alterations to the fenestration.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Settlement Gap - Countryside		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- F/05/54050 - Erection of single storey stable block & tack room – Refuse – Aug 2005 - F/06/56013 - Construction of single storey stable block & tack room – Permit – Apr 2006 - F/09/66174 - Construction of hay store – Refuse – Dec 2009 - F/10/66765 - Construction of hay store – Refuse – Apr 2010 - F/10/67814 - Construction of hay barn – Permit – Nov 2010 - F/11/68710 - Construction of hay barn (amended scheme) – Permit – Jul 2011 - F/11/69860 - Construction of hay barn – Permit – Aug 2012 - F/20/88060 - Raising of stable roof to provide loft storage space (Part retrospective) – Dismissed at appeal – Feb 2021 (Refused Sept 2020) - F/23/95495 - Retention of replacement roof to the stable building and provision of a reduced rear (northwest) dormer (Alternative to application F/20/88060) – Refuse – Nov 2023 - F/24/96999 - Retention of replacement roof to the stable building and removal of the rear (northwest) dormer (Resubmission of application F/23/95495) – Permit – May 2024 - LDC/25/99800 - Lawful Development Certificate for an Existing Use, Operation or Activity: Enlarged roof to stable building to include box dormer window – Certificate issued – Sept 2025		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Corringham House, Grange Road. Support. As a neighbour I favour the conversion to a 2 bedroom dwelling with associated parking. The building is not being changed as viewed from Grange Road in regard to size and stature, the only changes being internally and to the western elevation. The government is looking to increase housing stock and this is a prime example.		
Hound Parish Council:	Objects to the application on the following grounds: Whilst the existing building is now deemed lawful, Hound Parish Council considers that the previous planning history remains a significant material consideration. In dismissing appeal APP/W1715/W/3262351, the Planning Inspector concluded that the enlarged building had acquired a more residential appearance, created an urbanising effect, physically and visually diminishing the Strategic Gap, and harming the character and appearance of the countryside. The current proposal would further intensify that domestic character by introducing a permanent residential use, together with a residential curtilage, parking and associated domestic activity. The Parish Council is not aware of any material change in circumstances since the Inspector's decision that would justify		

	reaching a different planning conclusion and therefore asks the Local Planning Authority to give significant weight to the Inspector's findings when determining this application, which is in contradiction to the Eastleigh Local Plan.
Bursledon Parish Council:	No Comment
Ecology:	Holding objection At least two bat activity surveys are required within the active bat survey season, and ecological supervision may be required during construction. The premise within the PRA report (May 2026) was that works would not impact features within the roof which were not visible to the surveyor, however the Structural Report lists works required for residential conversion (no date but submitted in July 2026) which would require inspection access and works to the roof behind the existing boarding. Ecology There are records of bats near this site with hedgehogs and nesting swifts in the wider area. I have reviewed the Preliminary Roost and Nest Assessment (PRA) by ESLtd (May 2026). The building was assessed as having moderate potential to support bats with opportunities for crevice dwelling bats to roost beneath roof tiles and ridge tiles, and with gaps between gable windows and timber cladding which were checked and not occupied in April 2026. The report states that there is an existing bat box on the southeast elevation and bird boxes on each gable end. Photos show that one of these bird boxes is a swift nest box and the other is quite large and may be suitable for owls. The PRA report states that the proposed works would not affect these features. Section 3.1.1 states <i>Illustrated plans/proposal not yet available and The LPA is requested to ensure the understanding of the works in this report matches the remit within the proposed works submitted for planning</i>. However, the description of the current proposal includes alterations to fenestration and the Structural Report (no author or date) (which were not available to the ecological consultant) includes a list of works to be done. Therefore, roofing features will be affected. This paragraph in the PRA states that: <i>If this decision changes, (e.g. not impacting roofing features inclusive of tiles, membrane, interior insulation, wall tops and cavity walls, barges, soffits, hanging tiles, fenestration (within roof) and as applicable) this report is not sufficient to proceed to planning as Bat Emergence Surveys will be required to check the status of roosting bats within The Stables. The LPA is requested to ensure the understanding of the works in this report matches the remit within the proposed works submitted for planning.</i> The survey for this PRA was done at the beginning of April (7/4/26), and bats occupy different roosts throughout the season. Due to the proposed works and the potential roost features at least two bat activity surveys are required within the active bat survey season, and ecological supervision may be required during construction. Biodiversity net gain The PDAS states that the application site is a 0.076-hectare parcel and the site area is given as 0.07 ha in the planning application. Although the applicant is claiming the self-build and custom build exemption from providing 10% biodiversity net gain, some biodiversity enhancements are still required in accord with Local Plan policy DM 11 and NPPF (December 2024) paragraphs 187d and 192 b.

	The Planning, Design and Access Statement by Kalotec (no date), section 9.2 states that there is 203 m2 of private amenity area to the north. This area could be enhanced to provide some biodiversity net gain. The PDAS states that existing boundary vegetation would be retained but it has not been described in the ecology report. Enhancing the existing vegetation with additional flowering plants to attract pollinators and native hedgerow species which could provide food for wildlife could be an option for this site. Surface water drainage Surface water drainage information has not been submitted. What are the current surface water drainage arrangements for this property? Foul drainage is not within the remit of ecology, but I note that foul drainage arrangements have not been submitted with this application. Landscaping The existing boundary vegetation has not been described. Section 11 Landscaping of the PDAS states <i>The amenity 203 square metres of private amenity space will be grassed and enclosed by existing fencing and hedging, maintaining the rural character.</i> Additional flowering plants, flowering grassland and native shrubs could be added without affecting the rural character of the site. <u>Update (01/09/2026):</u> The existing and proposed plans document (rev B, August 2026) by Kalotec shows a storm water soakaway proposed in the drive and a blue line representing 5 m from any building on this property. The results of infiltration testing must be submitted to ensure that a soakaway will be successful in this location.
Hampshire Highways:	In regard to application F/26/101714, having reviewed the information contained within the application pack, there would be no objection to the proposals from a highway perspective. Access in and out of the site from the highway is unchanged and this is acceptable, and on-site there is adequate space for parking associated with a 2-bed dwelling, and also a turning space to allow for forward gear access and egress. Onwards, it is noted that a cycle store will be provided which is welcomed.
Southern Water:	Insufficient information provided.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 01/09/2026		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1, S2, S5 and S6; and Development Management policies DM1, DM10, DM11, DM14, DM19, DM29, and DM30. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places (June 2026); Parking Standards (September 2025); Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:
<u>Planning history</u>

The application building, in its original form was approved in 2006 under planning application reference F/06/56013, with this consent being subsequently implemented. The building, which incorporated 5 stables, was a single storey structure of a simple, functional appearance, comprising timber boarded walls under a low, tiled hipped roof. It was considered appropriate in size, scale and visual appearance for both its intended equestrian purpose as well as for its countryside setting.

The building was, however, subsequently altered without the benefit of planning consent. These alterations incorporated an increase in roof size to allow for the provision of a first-floor area to be used as a hay loft, with this being served by windows in either end of the building as well as a sizeable box dormer positioned along the western roof slope. These works were subject to a retrospective application in 2020 (F/20/88060) which was refused by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate with the Inspector identifying harm to the character and appearance of the area and the site's countryside and gap setting, with this arising from the increase in building size and the more domestic appearance of the structure which resulted from the box dormer and the nature of the fenestration that it incorporated.

A further application, which had proposed to retain the roof alterations but with a reduced dormer of an alternative pitched roof design, was also refused by the LPA in November 2023 (application F/23/95495), with the impacts upon the countryside and settlement gap not being considered to have been suitably overcome by the proposed revisions.

Application F/24/96999 sought to reduce the built form by removing the dormer to the north-west and as a result was subsequently approved. Nonetheless, a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC/25/99800) application was later submitted on the grounds that the built form had been in situ for over 4 years without an enforcement notice and as such immune from enforcement action, to which the certificate was issued, regularising the built form (with the box dormer in place).

This application now seeks to use this built form (with some alterations) and convert it into a 2-bedroom dwelling with associated curtilage and parking.

Principle and Policy

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 and will only be granted provided it relates to its criterion. 1(a) of this Policy sets out a criterion as "the provision of employment through agricultural development (policy DM17), the extension and replacement of existing employment uses (policy DM18) and the re-use of existing buildings (policy DM19)". 1(b) also sets out a criterion as "residential extensions and replacement buildings (policies DM18 and 26), limited residential conversions (policy DM19), rural workers' dwellings (policy DM27) and accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (policy DM31)". Policy S5 also goes on to stipulate (2) that new development in the countryside will seek to avoid adverse impacts upon the intrinsic character of the landscape.

The application site also falls within a settlement gap, protected by Policy S6, which ultimately seeks to ensure that development would not undermine the physical extent and/or visual separation of settlements, nor have an urbanising effect detrimental to the character of the countryside or the separate identity of adjoining settlements.

Therefore, in principle, this application could be supported if it can demonstrate accordance with the criteria within the policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), most notably policy DM19.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026) sets out National Decision-Making Policies (NDMP) to guide consideration and the weight to apply to certain areas.

NDMP S5 states “Only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, as set out in the following list. These should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework:” Section ‘1.h’ states that residential and mixed use development which would “Be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station” (i) and “Be physically well-related to the station or the settlement within which the station is located” (ii). The proposed dwelling conversion would be set outside of the settlement boundary and not within a reasonable walking distance to a station defined under the top 80 Travel to Work Area locations (in this case this would be Southampton which is ranked no.17 for the 2023 data) nor is it well-related to the settlement of that station. The site is located approx. 3.7 miles from Southampton Central train station (as the crow flies) which is the closest station to have at least 4 trains per hour and be considered ‘well-connected’. Google Maps estimates this walk to take 1 hour 36 minutes and is 4.3 miles which vastly exceeds the defined 10 minute or 800 metres ‘reasonable walking distance’ defined within the NPPF. Conditions (iii) and (iv) of policy S5 1.h do not apply to this site due to its size and as such does not prejudice these conditions.

Policy S5.3 also states, “Development proposals comprising isolated homes, which are those lying outside settlements or groups of houses, should not be approved other than in accordance with policy HO11.”. NDMP HO11 states “Development proposals for isolated homes in the countryside should only be supported where one or more of the following circumstances apply”. The criteria refers to the need for a rural worker, securing the future of heritage assets, reusing a redundant or disused building and enhance its immediate setting including the reuse of an underused listed building, the subdivision of an existing residential building, or that the design would be of exceptional quality. The only criteria this proposal has the potential of meeting is that it would reuse a building however there is no evidence supplied that this building is redundant or disused. This is also a required criteria within Eastleigh’s Local Plan policy DM19 and as such information to show how the building was unsuitable for other uses allowed within policy was requested from the agent. Nonetheless, the agent’s addendum to their planning statement does not satisfactorily address the LPA’s concerns.

As explained above, Policy DM19 (Change of use of buildings in the countryside) from the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) relates closely to the criteria set out in NDMP HO11 from the NPPF. DM19 specifies that a change of use to residential will only be permitted if:

- a) the building is demonstrably unsuitable for other uses allowed under this policy; or
- b) the proposal is for an agricultural worker’s dwelling and the terms of policy DM27 are met; or
- c) the building is of architectural or historic interest and there are no other means of securing its preservation (see also policy DM12); or
- d) it would achieve amenity, environmental or traffic benefits.

The application has not been capable of suitably demonstrating the building as unsuitable for other uses allowed within this policy. The proposal is not for an agricultural worker, the building is of no historic or architectural interest and has no benefits to the surrounding amenity, environment or traffic. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not accord with policy DM19 and subsequently does also not accord with policy S5 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

Moreover, within the Eastleigh Borough Settlement Gap Study which supported the Local Plan, the Gap Analysis of ‘Area A Bursledon, Southampton, Netley, Hamble’ situates the site within sub-area A9 defined as “Open field pattern and agriculture infrastructure with high degree of visibility toward Southampton edge, particularly high-rise buildings. The expansive flat field patterns contribute significantly towards the openness and sense of separation between the two settlements.”. Although no additional built form would be proposed with this application, the residential dwelling would intensify the use of the building to a degree that could urbanise the setting; detracting from the sense of separation currently experienced within this area. Therefore, the proposal is detrimental

to the character of the countryside and the separate identity of adjoining settlements, as such does not accord with policy S6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.

Design and layout

In order to facilitate the conversion to residential the existing stable block needs to undergo some fenestration alterations. This is mainly limited to the ground floor which replaces the stable doors residential glass doors and window along the west elevation. There is also a side window being replaced by another door on the south and a Juliet balcony screen added to the first-floor west elevation.

The proposed site layout demonstrates that the dwelling can accommodate 2.no on-site car parking spaces, in accordance with the Parking Standards SPD. Refuse storage is highlighted on the plan and further information could be conditioned if permission were recommended.

The proposed inclusion of a more residential character through the fenestration alterations and household paraphernalia to the existing stable block will result in an increased sense of urbanisation which will impact the character of the plot and surrounding countryside.

Residential amenity

The proposed amenity space also falls within accepted guidance stated within Quality Places SPD which requires there to be at least 60% of the total floor space provided. It is calculated the dwelling could provide approx. 168% amenity space compared to floor area, to the northern side. As this aspect of amenity space measures approx. 21 metres long, it is expected that this length is suitable on a northern side to provide some level of sunlight throughout the day.

In addition, the proposed dwelling would accord with the Nationally Described Space Standards and policy DM30 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036). A 2-bedroom 4-person two storey dwelling would need to measure at least 79 sqm. This proposed application measures 131.3 sqm and as such provides over the minimum standard. The submitted planning statement also addresses how this proposed dwelling can accord with building regulations part M4(1), under policy DM29 for higher access standards. If permission were to be granted, we would condition information to be submitted for the dwelling to accord with building regulations part M4(2).

The proposed dwelling would intensify the existing use of the stable block. However, the building is set away from existing neighbouring properties, and such is not expected to create any unacceptable harm to the amenity of the neighbours.

Ecology

The Council's ecologist has raised a holding objection on the grounds of potential harm to bats which are a protected species. The application has failed to provide the required bat activity surveys and as such insufficient information has been supplied to determine that application would not cause harm.

Policy DM11 of the Local Plan requires that a biodiversity net gain is provided on development sites, even when the statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) 10% requirement is not appropriate. This net gain can be to any degree and in this case the ecologist recommended that this could be provided through enhancing the existing vegetation with additional flowering plants to attract pollinators and native hedgerow species which could provide food for wildlife could be an option for this site. This could have been conditioned if the application were to be approved.

If the application has been recommended for approval, further information on surface water drainage and infiltration tests would have been requested for review. However, it is noted that this is an existing building with existing rainwater goods in place.

Planning balance

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Therefore, paragraph S5 1(j) of the NPPF forms part of the assessment. The proposal would provide one dwelling, which would make a small contribution to housing supply and therefore would not meaningfully address an unmet housing need.

The proposal would result in the introduction of an unjustified new dwelling within the countryside and settlement gap, contrary to policies S5 and S6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan. The site is physically and visually detached from the existing settlements, and the development would cause harm to the rural character and appearance of the area through the introduction of residential built form, domestic activity and associated paraphernalia. The site is also poorly located in accessibility terms and future occupiers would be likely to rely heavily on the private car for day-to-day journeys.

In addition, the proposal fails to secure the necessary mitigation for nutrient impacts and recreational pressure on the Solent and New Forest designated sites. In the absence of secured mitigation, the Council cannot conclude beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of protected habitat sites. The submitted information also fails to satisfy the Council's ecologists in that there would be no harm to protected species, such as bats.

Overall, the limited benefits arising from one additional dwelling are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the identified harms, including the conflict with policies S5, S6 and DM19 of the Local Plan and policies S5 and HO11 of the NPPF. The scheme would also introduce harm to the rural character and appearance of the area, would be poorly accessible, and does not provide information required to satisfy concerns for protected species, biodiversity enhancement and protected habitat mitigation. The proposal does not represent sustainable development and is contrary to the development plan when read as a whole. Permission should therefore be refused.

Climate Change and Equalities 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 2030; (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 Environment 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, development plan and adopted local plan policy 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 adopted 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, 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 reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 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

Recommendation:	PERMIT ☐	REFUSE ☒
1. The proposed conversion to result in a new dwelling in the countryside and settlement gap would result in an isolated home with no sustainable transport connections and has not been shown to be demonstrably unsuitable for another form of conversion allowed within policy. The proposal would also result in an intensification of the use of the building and immediate surroundings which would contribute to an increased sense of urbanisation, detrimental to the character of the countryside and identities of adjoining settlements. As such it is contrary to policies S5, S6 and DM19 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026), most notably policies S5 and HO11. 2. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development will not cause adverse harm to the biodiversity interests of the site and species, including bats which are protected by virtue of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended). The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036. 3. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that a biodiversity net gain can be achieved on site and as such is contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 4. The application fails to provide for the required mitigation to offset the impacts of the development on the European protected sites (i.e. Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area & Ramsar Site, Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation & New Forest Special Protection Area, Ramsar & Special Area of Conservation) from nutrient loading and recreational disturbance generated by the population increase resulting from the development. The application is therefore contrary to The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), Policies S1, DM10 and DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.		