

Zoe Day
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Application	F/24/97740
Your Ref:	APP/W1715/W/25/3371897
Please ask for	Clare Martin
Direct dial	023 8068 8256
Working hours	Tues-Fri
Email	clare.martin@eastleigh.gov.uk

24th September 2025

Dear Ms Day

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)
(England) Order 2015

Appeal By:	WPS Developments
Appeal Ref:	APP/W1715/W/25/3371897
Application No:	F/24/97740
Description:	The erection of a dwelling to replace an existing mobile home
Site:	THE LOG CABIN, HILLVIEW MANOR PARK, WINCHESTER ROAD, FAIR OAK, EASTLEIGH, SO50 7HD

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) are of the opinion that the Appellant's statement (by Mark Simmonds August 2025) raises no significant new issues or evidence. As such we would ask that the appointed Inspector treats the delegated officer report and consultee responses, which were submitted with the appeal questionnaire, as the LPA's statement of case together with the following comments.

Reason for refusal 1: Impact upon the countryside and locality

In paragraph 3.3 & 5.1.3 the Appellant states that the proposed dwelling largely sits on the footprint of the existing dwelling. The LPA disagrees with this statement as the proposed dwelling has a floor area of 175m², which is more than three times the size of the existing mobile home and therefore is not on the same footprint. Indeed, it is the LPA's view that the scale and massing of the proposed dwelling, along with its elevated position in relation to Winchester Road, would have a detrimental impact on the countryside locality when compared to the existing mobile home.

Paragraph 5.1.4. of the statement argues that the proposed dwelling is of a unique and innovative design. However, while the dwelling is not unattractive, it is the LPA's view that the proposal does not meet the high requirement of an outstanding or

innovative design, in that it does not raise the standards of design in the locality or promote high levels of sustainability (as set out within para 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework).

In paragraph 5.1.2. the Appellant notes that they wish to replace the existing mobile home with a family house for the new site manager and is part of a wider investment into the caravan park. However, the Appellant has not demonstrated why the manager of a residential caravan park needs to live at the site, particularly when there are family houses for sale within Fair Oak and Colden Common that are a short drive away. Furthermore, while it maybe the Appellant's intention to invest in the site no further applications have been submitted since the two planning application were refused for fourteen tourist lodges and ten residential lodges in 2023 (planning applications F/23/95180 & F/23/95181).

Finally, the Appellants statement is supported by three appeal decisions for new countryside dwellings from other parts of England. These appeal decisions are based on their own unique set of circumstances and would have been assessed against different local plan policies. As such it is the LPA view that the appeal decisions are not directly relevant to the current appeal, and the Planning Inspector is respectfully reminded that all planning application should be judged on their own merits.

Reason for refusal 2: Impact on reptiles

The LPA disagrees with the Appellant's conclusion that a reptile survey is unnecessary. It is the professional opinion of the Council's Ecologists that the site photos and description within the preliminary ecological assessment (PEA) imply that this area may be particularly suitable for reptiles. While a PEA was included in the planning submission, this covered the wider site as a whole and the potential presence of reptiles need to be fully understood through a specialist survey.

Furthermore, reptiles have not been included in the PEA's Summary of Recommendations table (section 5.2) and while there are no records of reptiles in the area, this may be due to a lack of surveys due to a lack of development adjacent to the site, rather than a lack of reptiles. The presence of protected species and priority habitats is a material consideration, and the reptile survey should be considered as part of the appeal rather than via a planning condition.

Five Year Housing Land Supply

While not raised within the Appellant's statement, the council latest housing supply report (as of 1 April 2024) identifies a supply of 4.1 years of deliverable housing, including a 5% buffer. While this is under the five year housing land supply (required by the National Planning Policy Framework), it is the LPA's view that the delivery of the single appeal dwelling would have only a minimal impact upon the Council housing provision and this would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the

harm the dwelling would have on its countryside location as well as the potential impact upon protected species.

Conclusion

The LPA respectfully requests that the Inspector upholds the reasons for refusal and dismisses the appeal. However, should the Inspector be minded to grant permission, the LPA would ask that the conditions attached in Appendix A are included as part of any approval.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "N Parker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Nicholas Parker
Planning Manager