

Morris, Rachael

From: Morris, Rachael
Sent: 30 May 2024 10:34
To: Morris, Rachael
Subject: FW: Planning application for Removal/variation of conditions at James Mead farm application ref x/24/97156

From: David Ashe < >
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2024 12:32 PM
To: Planning @ Eastleigh Borough Council <Planning@eastleigh.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application for Removal/variation of conditions at James Mead farm application ref x/24/97156

ADD is an umbrella group that had its roots in the engagement of Local Residents groups in opposition to the previous proposals for development in the area including the application that formed part of the local plan proposals published in 2015. These proposals were rejected by the inspector at the Examination in Public in 2020. ADD represents local parish councils, residents associations and amenity groups, and has been supported by CPRE and a number of national like minded national organisations.

We object to the application for removal of the agricultural/ horsebreeding tie to the ruined farmhouse at James Mead Farm on the grounds that it would create a new residential dwelling within the countryside.

It is clear that the existing house is unusually large for an essential agricultural worker accommodation. Were it to be proposed for this site as a new agricultural tie it would be contrary to policy DM27 g in that it is in excess of 120 sq m.

However it exists as an agricultural tied house. It is in a ruinous state and is beyond economic repair. It will therefore need to be completely rebuilt.

It would be entirely within the grounds of possibility to rebuild it as an agricultural tied dwelling at the current size, or smaller.

The planning statement contains an agricultural viability report from Ian Judd and Partners. This attempts to demolish the economic case for the adjacent land and the dwelling part of this application to be run as a viable smallholding. However this ignores the fact that within the neighbourhood, (taking an arbitrary 5 mile radius), there are a number of land holdings of considerably smaller size where an economic case has been successfully made in the last 10 -15 years to justify the viability of an agricultural/equestrian business requiring a rural worker to live on site. The average size of these land holdings is about 5 Hectares.

The Agricultural viability report is therefore partial and misleading. To be taken as objective it should contain a comparative analysis of local equestrian businesses, including their land area.

In the absence of this it seems only reasonable to expect the applicant to demonstrate that the property should have been actively marketed as a 10 Hectare farm with consent for an equestrian business with a tied rural worker dwelling of up to the 350sq m size of the current ruined house.

Without either of these pieces of evidence we would urge officers and committee to reject this application.

David Ashe
Chair, ADD