
Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill,
Bursledon

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	The Appeal Site Location and Description	3
3.	The Appeal Proposal	4
4.	Planning History	6
5.	Planning Policy	8
6.	Appeal Procedure and Presentation of Evidence	9
7.	Proofs of Evidence	10
8.	Case for the Appellant	11
9.	Conclusion	15

1. Introduction

1.1. This Statement of Case has been prepared on behalf of Colten Care Limited (hereafter referred to as the 'Appellant'). It relates to a planning appeal made pursuant to Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in respect of Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon (the 'appeal site').

1.2. The Appeal has been lodged following the refusal of full planning permission (LPA erf: F/24/97312) by Eastleigh Borough Council (the Local Planning Authority) on 29 November 2024 for:

"Construction of Residential Care Community, comprising a 69-bed care home (Use Class C2) and 5 x 2-bedroom close care cottages (Use Class C3 age restricted), with associated access, internal access road, parking, landscaping and infrastructure (amended description) (updated plans and further information received October 2024)."

1.3. The application was reported to the Planning Committee meeting on 21 November 2024 with an Officer's recommendation of approval.

1.4. There were no technical objections to the application. Further information was sought in relation to Air Quality with the recommendation to allow development subject to the review and agreement of the air quality impacts and any necessary mitigation in an updated report. An objection was raised by Natural England in relation to mitigation of the impacts on the New Forest protected sites for five dwellings, however, matters relating to nutrient impacts and recreation disturbance will be addressed through migration secured within the S106.

1.5. Paragraphs 218 to 220 of the committee report concluded:

"The proposal would see the development of an allocated site in the urban edge and would contribute positively towards the provision of accommodation for older persons in the Borough. The layout has been designed to take account of a variety of site constraints and although the care home would be significant in size, it has been sited and designed to minimise visual impacts on the surrounding area. The setting of the nearby listed Bursledon Windmill would be protected and the development would have a high quality landscaped setting.

Impacts on neighbouring residents have been carefully considered and it is acknowledged that the views for the nearest residents would be significantly altered from the present situation. However, suitable separation distances would be achieved between the care home and the neighbouring residents to accord with local policy guidance aimed at protecting residential amenity.

The vehicle access is acceptable and the parking proposals are considered appropriate and justified.

The development is not considered to have an adverse impact on the operation of the local highway network or highway safety. Other technical matters and policy requirements including drainage, tree protection, prevention of impacts on nature conservation, pollution mitigation (subject to agreement of air quality impacts), and provision of biodiversity net gain have been taken into account and satisfactorily addressed.

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



The proposal is considered to accord with the Development Plan and is therefore recommended for permission."

- 1.6. Members voted to refuse the application, contrary to the Officer's recommendation and a decision notice was issued on 29 November 2024 with six reasons for refusal cited, as follows:
- 1) The proposed care home, due to its excessive height and bulk and close proximity to the rear garden boundaries of Nos 1-4 Brookfield, would represent a visually dominant, overbearing and intrusive form of development when viewed from the adjacent rear gardens, resulting in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the existing residents. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).
 - 2) The proposed development would have insufficient on-site parking and would result in the loss of existing parking for adjacent residents, which would result in increased pressure for parking on Providence Hill, leading to increased highway safety risks from obstructions caused by unauthorised parking. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).
 - 3) Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that a care home of the proposed scale would not place undue pressure on healthcare services in the local area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy S10 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).
 - 4) Due to the speed and volume of traffic on Providence Hill, the increased level of vehicles entering and leaving the site from the proposed new access for such a large scale development, would pose increased risk to highway safety on the local highway network, contrary to Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).
 - 5) In the absence of developer's contributions towards public art, community infrastructure, public open space, sustainable transport and a traffic regulation order, the development would not make provision for the infrastructure improvements necessitated by the proposed development. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM38 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).
 - 6) In the absence of mitigation, the development would fail to offset its impacts on the European protected sites from nutrient loading and recreational pressure. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
- 1.7. This statement sets out the Appellant's case. An Inquiry has been requested as the most appropriate method of dealing with the appeal. We reserve the right to submit further evidence in response to matters raised by the Council, its advisors, statutory consultees or third parties in relation to matters not covered within this Statement of Case. A draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has also been prepared.
- 1.8. The Appellant will seek to engage with the Local Planning Authority to narrow down the issues that remain in dispute through Statements of Common Ground (SoCG).

2. The Appeal Site Location and Description

- 2.1. The application site comprises a roughly triangular parcel of land located on the northern boundary of the A27 abutting Providence Hill and is 1.1ha in area. 'Brookfield', which comprises four semi-detached properties that front onto the north side of Providence Hill, lies to the south east of the site.
- 2.2. A grouping of 29 modern homes sits to the north of the site, which was granted planning permission in 2016, recognised today as Goslings Turning.
- 2.3. The site is undeveloped land, currently characterised by overgrown brambles to the westerly corner of the site, with the remainder being generally grassland. Trees line the perimeter of the site which are subject to formal protection measures. This includes veteran oak trees. A brook runs along the northern edge of the site.
- 2.4. The topography of the site is notable and relevant to the development proposals that have been devised. The site falls away from south to north from Providence Hill down to the level of the brook, beyond which it then begins to rise again through the Goslings Turning development and then beyond to where Bursledon Windmill, a listed building, and associated development occupy higher ground. Some limited views are available from Providence Hill towards the windmill, which have been carefully considered and have influenced the manner in which the development proposals have evolved in consultation with the Council's planning and heritage specialists.
- 2.5. Vehicular and pedestrian access into the site are currently available from two positions on the north side of Providence Hill. The site is in private ownership and public access is not authorised.

3. The Appeal Proposal

- 3.1. The Planning Application subject of this appeal was submitted to Eastleigh Borough Council on 29 April 2024. The description of development was as follows:

“Construction of Residential Care Community, comprising a 73-bed care home (Use Class C2) and 5 x 2-bedroom close care cottages (Use Class C3 age restricted), with associated access, internal access road, parking, landscaping and infrastructure (planning ref: F/24/97312).”

- 3.2. The application was submitted in full.
- 3.3. The scheme consists of a care home building with ancillary facilities for residents, age restricted cottages, landscaped grounds and the provision of a new vehicle access on the southern boundary of the site, to Providence Hill, with car and bike parking and on-site turning for commercial vehicles.
- 3.4. The care home has been designed to make the best and most appropriate use of this allocated site to deliver functional and high quality specialist housing for older people, whilst also making an appropriate and positive contribution to the local townscape, protecting heritage, environmental and ecological interests along with the living conditions of neighbouring homes.
- 3.5. The proposal protects the established trees bordering the site with positive landscape enhancements and BNG measures incorporated as a key design feature of the proposal.
- 3.6. The design and layout conserves local heritage assets, preserving views of Bursledon Windmill and its setting.
- 3.7. The design considers local architectural styles including historic rural agricultural and industrial buildings in terms of the treatment of roofs, gables and ridge heights, in a way that also creates visual interest.
- 3.8. In terms of the care home provision and operation aspects, the key points are as follows:
- The facility is designed to be able to cater for different levels of care including nursing, palliative, respite and dementia.
 - The bed spaces would be accompanied by ancillary facilities to support residents and staff; these include staff rooms, laundry facilities, kitchens, lounges, bistro, dining room, nurse stations and hair salon/ spa.
 - The internal layout is configured to ensure accessibility and efficiency in caring for residents.
 - Internal spaces are designed to maximise natural light, and accessibility to outdoor spaces.
- 3.9. Following extensive discussions with the Local Planning Authority the proposal was amended and a revised scheme (under the same application reference) was submitted on 25 July 2024 with the following amendments made:
- The number and extent of dormers on the south facing roof have been reduced, ensuring there would be no perceived overlooking.

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



- The projection of the south easterly wing has been reduced in plan form and the roof pitch relaxed. The reduced built form increases external amenity space and removes the single storey-built form from the rear boundaries of 1 and 2 Brookfield. It also eliminates the pinch point between building and boundary where 1 Brookfield's garden has been extended.
- The amendments to the building result in a reduction of four bedrooms, from 73 to 69.
- Internal amendments have resulted in an amendment to the position of the lower ground floor lounge.
- Terracing and steps have been introduced between the sunken garden and wider site.
- The top of the retaining wall to the south side of the sunken garden will be replaced by a glass balustrade.
- The path has been omitted from the veteran oak root zone.
- New stepped access from the perimeter path to the parking court facilitates a circular walking route in lieu of path over the veteran oak. This relates to the stepped retaining wall to the north side of the lower parking court as issued previously.
- Installation of glazed privacy screens to a height of 1.5m shall be added to the north facing (private terrace and communal terrace. This will further reduce any perceived overlooking to the properties within Goslings Turning. The glazing is proposed to have a tree leaf textured pattern to provide obscurity.

3.10. The description of development was revised as per the description listed on the refusal notice and copied below:

"Construction of Residential Care Community, comprising a 69-bed care home (Use Class C2) and 5 x 2-bedroom close care cottages (Use Class C3 age restricted), with associated access, internal access road, parking, landscaping and infrastructure."

3.11. The revised proposal was recommended by officers for approval at the Bursledon, Hamble and Hound Local Area Committee on 21 November 2024 but, contrary to that recommendation, it was refused by members for the reasons set out in section 1 of this Statement.

4. Planning History

- 4.1. Prior to the submission of application F/24/97312, two applications had been submitted and considered by the LPA, as follows:

O/17/80899: Erection of up to 20no. dwellings with associated parking, creation of new access from Providence Hill substation and attenuation pond (landscaping reserved). This was withdrawn by the applicant despite a positive resolution by the Committee (8 October 2020).

F/22/93160: Mixed-use development comprising veterinary surgery and 14no. dwellings with vehicular access off Providence Hill and associated car parking, cycle storage, sustainable drainage system, substation, hard and soft landscaping, acoustic fencing and pedestrian/ cycle links to Providence Hill. The application was refused on 31 January 2023. The reasons for refusal are as follows:

- 1) The proposed development fails to make an efficient use of the site, with insufficient justification given for the excessive land take of the veterinary surgery and the resultant significant shortfall in the level of housing provision when considered against the housing allocation in Policy BU1. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies S1, DM1 & BU1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 2) The proposal, by means of its layout, scale, form, design, appearance, and levels treatment would result in a poor-quality development, which is overly reliant on engineering solutions, would have an adverse visual impact and fails to meet the necessary standards in terms of urban design, residential amenity, residential car parking, street trees, and public open space. The proposal is therefore contrary Policies S1, S9, DM1, DM14, DM33 & BU1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036); the Council's Quality Places SPD, Residential Parking Standards SPD, Trees & Development SPD and Planning Obligations SPD; and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3) The veterinary surgery and associated car park (due to its siting, scale, design, massing, detailing and the extent of hard surfacing) would create an unattractive and incongruous feature that fails to create a sense of place or take account of its surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036); the Council's Quality Places SPD and Trees & Development SPD; and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4) The development fails to provide a well-integrated sustainable urban drainage system of a capacity to serve the development and has the potential to detrimentally impact existing mature trees. Furthermore, the sustainable drainage system fails to provide three forms of natural filtration, which is necessary to maintain the quality of runoff water, entering the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation. The application is therefore contrary to The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended); the requirements of Policies S1, DM1, DM5, DM6, DM11 & BU1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036); and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



- 5) Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the site is able to accommodate the development proposed without having an unacceptable impact on either the health and long-term retention of important trees, or the function and water quality of the adjoining stream that flows into Windmill Woods Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. Furthermore, the development fails to provide existing hydrological, chemical and water quality information for the headwater. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1, DM11 & BU1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036); the Council's Trees and Development Supplementary Planning Document; and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 6) The application fails to secure provision for developer contributions for the on and off-site provision of facilities and infrastructure made necessary by the development or to mitigate against any increased need or pressure on existing facilities. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies DM28, DM33, DM36 & DM38 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036); the Eastleigh Borough Council's Planning Obligations SPD and Affordable Housing SPD; and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 7) 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.

5. Planning Policy

- 5.1. The planning policies and guidance that are of most relevance to this appeal are set out in the SoCG. It is anticipated that the main planning policy issues will be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the preparation of evidence.
- 5.2. The Appellant will refer to national policies and guidance set out in the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
- 5.3. The Appellant will explain that the Development Plan for the area is comprised of the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan 2016-2036.
- 5.4. Where relevant, reference will be made to supplementary planning guidance, documents and advice available.
- 5.5. Where relevant, reference will be made to relevant legislation including the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Environment Act 2021.

6. Appeal Procedure and Presentation of Evidence

- 6.1. The Appellant considers that a Public Inquiry would be the most appropriate appeal procedure for this case.
- 6.2. It is the Appellant's intention to work with the Local Planning Authority to narrow down the matters set out in the reasons for refusal within the Statement of Common Ground, however it is anticipated that complex issues may remain unresolved.
- 6.3. The Planning Committee did not accept the professional advice of officers in relation to matters of highway safety or the impact of the development on health care services, with matters raised in relation to both issues for the first time in the committee and contrary to consultee advice provided during the considerations of the application. It will be necessary for the Local Planning Authority to provide evidence to justify the departure from professional advice given to members, which led to the refusal of the application and will require consideration of the evidence submitted by them.
- 6.4. Furthermore, matters relating to design and parking arrangements for the development require careful consideration and explanation of the site, its topography, its surrounds and land ownership matters, which require the presentation and examination of detailed evidence to inform the Inspector's decision.
- 6.5. Respectfully, the issues should be tested through formal questioning of Expert Witnesses by an Advocate, which would not be permissible under the Informal Hearing Procedure.
- 6.6. The Appellant considers that three days would be required, depending on the extent of evidence advanced by the Local Planning Authority and the extent of public involvement in the process. This timescale is to include a site visit.
- 6.7. On the basis that the Planning Inspectorate agrees to this appeal being dealt with under the Public Inquiry procedure, the Appellant will prepare written evidence in advance of the Public Inquiry to address the putative reasons for refusal.

7. Proofs of Evidence

7.1. On the basis that the appeal proceeds by way of an Inquiry, the Appellant will prepare written evidence for submission in advance of the Inquiry to address the Reasons for Refusal.

7.2. It is anticipated that evidence will be presented as follows:

Planning

- Bryony Stala, Director, MRTPI

Design, Layout and Scale

- Lisa Sumner, Design Director, BA (Hons) PGDip BArch MA RIBA

Highways

- Mark Smith, Director, BA (Hons) Geography, MCIHT

Health Care Requirements

- Andrew Buroni, Director PhD Health Impact Assessment methods and best practice, MSc Environmental Impact Assessment, BSc (Hons) Biological and Biomedical Sciences

7.3. The Appellant reserves the right to introduce additional witnesses as required to address any other matters raised by the Local Planning Authority or by other parties during the appeal process.

8. Case for the Appellant

8.1. A draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been submitted as part of the appeal. It is anticipated that the final SoCG will set out that the Appellant and the Local Planning Authority are in agreement with the following issues:

- Principle of development
- Development plan designations
- Landscape and visual
- Heritage impacts
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Archaeology
- Trees
- Other infrastructure
- Developers contributions
- Impact on protected European sites
- Biodiversity net gain requirements

8.2. The following matters are considered to be the main issues:

Issue 1 Principle of Development

Issue 2 Housing land supply

Issue 3 Impact on Residential Amenity

Issue 4 Parking

Issue 5 Impact on health care services

Issue 6 Highway Safety

Issue 1 Principle of Development

8.3. Whilst this is not considered an issue of dispute, the Appellant will set out how the proposal accords with the adopted development plan and confirm that the principle of development is acceptable. The Appellant will confirm that the provision of a care home facility and close care cottages in this location is supported by policy, and the site is considered to be in a suitable sustainable location.

Issue 2 Housing Land Supply

8.4. The Appellant will consider Eastleigh Borough Councils' five year housing land supply position in the context of paragraph 11 of the NPPF, presumption in favour of sustainable development. Data published by Planning magazine on 25 April 2025 identifies Eastleigh Borough Council as having a 4.70 HLS position. This figure is explained as having taken into account the revisions of the December 2024 NPPF and the publication of the 2023 housing delivery test (HDT). Further to this, an appeal decision dated 12 December 2024 references the Council's HLS as being below five years. The appellant will set out the relevance of

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



the lack of a five year housing land supply in the consideration of this appeal and argue that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied.

Issue 3 Impact on Residential Amenity

- 8.5. The Appellant will explain the context of the site, the design process which took into account the complex constraints of the site, along with the design principles applied to the final scheme. Through reference to consultee comments and the amendments made during the course of the application, it will be demonstrated that the proposal is appropriate and will not harm the residential amenities of existing properties.
- 8.6. The Appellant will demonstrate that the scale and design of the development meets the requirements of design policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the Quality Spaces supplementary planning design guide.
- 8.7. The Appellant will demonstrate that there are no reasonable grounds to refuse the development on design grounds.

Issue 4 Parking

- 8.8. The Appellant will set out the three distinct matters referenced within Reason for Refusal 2 with regards to parking provision for the development, specifically (i) whether the proposed development provides sufficient car parking for the development uses; (ii) whether there would be displaced parking on Providence Hill due to the removal of car parking on site; and (iii) if either (i) or (ii) are true and result in increased parking pressure on Providence Hill, whether that would lead to highway safety concerns.
- 8.9. The Appellant will demonstrate that the parking provision on site is sufficient in meeting the needs of the development in relation to both adopted policy requirements and the operational need of the care home. The information will be demonstrated in the context of the Hampshire County Council Highway's consultation response which considered the level of car parking proposed as acceptable.
- 8.10. The Appellant will highlight that there is no legal right for vehicles relating to neighbouring properties 1-4 Brookfield or any other, to park on land within the development site without permission of the applicant and thus there is no issue regarding displaced parking as a result of the development.
- 8.11. The Appellant will demonstrate that there are no highways safety risks resulting from the proposed parking arrangement. In addition, information will be provided regarding the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO – double yellow lining) as part of the S106 to ensure that concerns regarding parking on Providence Hill would not cause obstructions to visibility such that might result in highway safety concerns.
- 8.12. The Appellant will demonstrate to the Inspectorate that the proposed development will not result in overspill parking onto Providence Hill as a result of the quantum of car parking proposed to serve the development site, that there would not be a loss of an existing parking facility that adjacent properties are legally permitted to use, and that highway safety from 'overspill parking' would not be compromised by a result of the development.

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



Issue 5 Impact on health care services

- 8.13. The Appellant will highlight that no additional information was sought by officers during the course of the application in relation to the impact of the care home on local health care services, nor was an objection raised by the NHS Hampshire and Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board to the proposal. The Appellant will demonstrate that no such adverse impact will occur as a result of the development.

Issue 6 Highway Safety

- 8.14. In respect to highway safety matters raised in Reason for Refusal 4, the Appellant will demonstrate that the Transport Statement submitted with the application demonstrated that safe and suitable access was achievable to the site, and the evidence submitted was considered satisfactory by HCC highways as the statutory highway authority and supported by EBC planning officers within their committee report.
- 8.15. In reference to speed and volume of traffic on Providence Hill, Table 1 of the Transport Statement summarised third-party traffic survey results of speed and flow on Providence Hill over the course of a full week in February 2024. Eighty fifth (85th) percentile speeds were recorded below the posted speed limit of 40mph, and 12-hour (7am-7pm) traffic volumes for a weekday recorded at an average of circa 6,100 movements in each direction.
- 8.16. Traffic movements using the site access were calculated using the industry-standard TRICS database, and as summarised in Chapter 5 of the Transport Statement, the development is anticipated to generate 10am peak vehicle movements, 6pm peak vehicle movements and 164 movements across the 12-hour (7am-7pm) day. Such movements are very modest in relation to traffic on Providence Hill, with HCC highways confirming there is *"no justifiable reason to object from a trip generation/highway network perspective."*
- 8.17. There is no obstruction to visibility from the proposed site access, and vehicle tracking has been completed for a variety of vehicles (including private car, delivery van, refuse vehicle and fire tender) to the satisfaction of the highway authority.
- 8.18. Furthermore, an independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was completed on the development proposals that raised no concerns with the principles of the junction following a designer's response to the two comments raised.
- 8.19. Accident data was also obtained from Hampshire Constabulary for the most recently available 60-month period at the time of submitting the application (Appendix D of the Transport Statement), which identified only four accidents within the study area requested by the highway authority. Given the volume of traffic that utilises Providence Hill on a daily basis, there is no identified accident trend which the proposed development could exacerbate.
- 8.20. There are also two noteworthy previous planning applications on the site which shared similar access arrangements to that proposed with this appeal. Under O/17/80899, outline planning permission was sought for up to 20 dwellings, with access via a single bellmouth junction onto Providence Hill. Whilst the application was withdrawn, no highway objection was received for this application. Under F/22/93160, a mixed use consent was sought for a veterinary surgery and 14 dwellings, again with a bellmouth access onto Providence Hill. Whilst EBC refused this planning application, no highway reasons for refusal or

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



concerns were raised regarding access (with HCC highways again satisfied), despite that application generating substantially greater volumes of traffic that the current appeal site.

Appeal Statement of Case

Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon



9. Conclusion

- 9.1. This Statement of Case has been prepared on the basis that the appeal will be dealt with at a Public Inquiry. The Appellant reserves the right to expand upon its case to address any other issue that may evolve in discussions with the Local Planning Authority on the Statement of Common Ground and to be able to amend this Statement of Case if the Inspectorate does not accept that the appeal should be heard by way of public inquiry.

Bryony Stala
Director

+44 (0) 23 8071 3955
+44 (0) 7807 999 328
BStala@savills.com

Mountbatten House
1 Grosvenor Square
Southampton
SO15 2BZ