

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Application	F/25/99153
Your Ref:	6000685
Please ask for	Clare Martin
Direct dial	023 8068 8256
Working hours	Tues-Fri
Email	clare.martin@eastleigh.gov.uk

25th September 2025

Dear Sir/ Madam

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

Appeal by:	Mark Durrant
Appeal Ref:	6000685
Application No:	F/25/99153
Description:	Construction of 1no. three bed single storey dwelling
Site:	Land off Brook Lane, Broadoak, Botley, SO30 2ER

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) are of the opinion that the Appellant's statement, (by Mark Durrant of Planning by Design), 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.

Other Appeal Decisions

The Appellants statement quotes two allowed appeal decisions for new countryside dwellings, namely La Luna Farm in Northumberland for which a temporary dwelling had previously been permitted on the site (APP/P2935/ W/23/3336018) and Shottesbrooke Hill Farm in Maidenhead which had been operating as a profitable cattle business since 2014 (APP/T0355/W/24/3352791). These appeal decisions are based on their own unique set of circumstances, which differ from the current appeal and would have been assessed against their own set of local plan policies for that particular part of the country. As such it is the LPA view that the appeal decisions provided 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.

Five Year Housing Land Supply

The council's 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 minimal impact upon the Council housing provision and this would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the harm the dwelling would have on the character of the countryside location and the erosion of the settlement gap.

Local Plan Policies

The Appellant's statement incorrectly quotes Policies S7 & DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036). Policy S7 relates to development on the coast and so is not relevant for the appeal proposal for a rural workers dwelling. Whereas Policy DM1 is the general development criteria for new development and not specifically dwellings in the countryside. The most appropriate policies are Policy S5 (new development in the countryside), Policy S6 (protection of settlement gaps) and Policy DM27 (rural workers dwellings), none of which allow for unrestricted residential developments within the countryside.

Impact On the Special Protection Area

The Planning Inspector's attention is drawn to the delegated officer report, which explains the development's impact (in terms an increase in nutrients and recreational disturbance) on the Solent Special Protection Area and the New Forest Special Protection Areas. While the Council operates a nutrient offsetting scheme [Nutrient Neutrality](#) the Appellant has chosen not to use this and instead has put forward their own mitigation involving installing a package treatment plant for foul drainage and planting an orchard to assist in nutrient mitigation. However, the Appellant has failed to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that these mitigation measures would work effectively.

To mitigate for recreational disturbance, the Appellant has indicated that they are willing to make financial contributions to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy and Council's New Forest Mitigation Strategy. While these are approved mitigation schemes, the contributions have not been secured as part of the planning application or current appeal. The LPA is prepared to enter into a legal agreement or accept an upfront payment for the required contributions, but no approach has been made by the Appellant to secure these contributions.

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, appearing to read "N Parker", with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Nicholas Parker
Planning Manager