

PLANNING

TWYFORD PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held on Thursday 6th October 2022 at 7.30pm
At The Gilbert Room, Twyford Parish Hall

Present:

Cllr. Lawton (in the Chair), Cllr. Corcoran, Cllr.
Mitchell, Cllr. Hill, Cllr. Pullen

In attendance:

J.P. Matthews – Clerk
3 members of the public.

Item	Business Transacted
P23/22	Chairman's Comments The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.
P24/22	Apologies for Absence There were no apologies for absence.
P25/22	Request for Dispensation and Declarations of Interest None were received
P26/22	Public Representation Three members of the public spoke regarding their objections to application 04058/FUL. The concerns raised included the impact on the rural landscape, noise and impact to adjacent residential areas and the proposals do not conform with local planning policy. The proposed development did not bring any socio-economic benefit to the village and there had been no direct engagement by the applicant with the local community before submitting the application. Concerns were also raised that the existing amenity block is being used in manner that does not have planning consent.
P27/22	Approval of Minutes It was Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 7 th September 2022 be approved and signed.
P28/22	Twyford Neighbourhood Plan Cllr. Corcoran gave an overview of LHE1 and explained the purpose of strategic gaps to the south and west of Twyford.
P29/22	It was Resolved to submit the following comments to the SDNPA on planning Applications received: SDNP/22/01499/HOUS 21 Churchfields Twyford Hampshire SO21 1NN No objection to the amended designs.

	<p>SDNP/22/04058/FUL The Sanctuary Manor Farm Green Twyford Hampshire SO21 1RA</p> <p>The Council objects to this application in respect of several matters, including the lack of cohesive plan as to how the whole of the site would function together, along with a lack of detail regarding certain aspects of the proposals.</p> <p>Cllr. Corcoran will prepare a more detailed representation covering these matters and these are attached in the appendices.</p> <p>SDNP/22/04237/CND Cobham House High Street Twyford Hampshire SO21 1RG</p> <p>No objection</p>
P30/22	<p>Update on planning decisions September 2022</p> <p>The report, which in the appendices, was received and noted.</p>
P31/22	<p>Winchester City Council Local Plan</p> <p>The draft local plan is due to be published for consultation shortly. It was Resolved to set up a working group consisting of Cllr. Corcoran, who would chair the group, and Cllr. Lawton. The group would also appoint other members as it sees fit and prepare a report for the December 2022 meeting of Full Council.</p>
P32/22	<p>Hockley Golf Club</p> <p>The Chairman updated members and advised that, along with Cllr. Corcoran and Cllr. Mitchell, he had attended the club and been briefed on proposals to carry out works to the club grounds including the construction of a new reservoir and driving range. As part of the proposals a significant of 'fill' would have to be transported into the site. The issue of movements of lorries and routes into and from the club were raised. A full planning application is expected to be submitted in due course.</p>
P33/22	<p>Land Compensation Act</p> <p>Members considered that there was merit in exploring whether additional noise from the changes to the operation of Southampton Airport could lead to a claim under this act.</p> <p>It was Resolved for Cllr. Mitchell to speak with a representative of GOESA Ltd and report back to the committee.</p>
P34/22	<p>Items for future meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review representation made for SDNP/22/02181/FUL & SDNP/22/02180/FUL
The meeting closed at 9.27 pm	

Minute 30/22 - Planning Update – Planning Committee October 2022

Applications Determined in September 2022

T1 magnolia - The tree is touching the house and is growing to big for the area it is in. 1-2m back from building on the northern laterals and 2-3m off the high. The tree was suppressed by recently removed conifers so no pruning required on southern aspect.

5 Segars Lane Twyford Hampshire SO21 1QJ

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04192/TCA | Received: Thu 08 Sep 2022 | Validated: Mon 12 Sep 2022 | Status: No Objection

T1: Maple- Fell to ground level. tree is in decline in the portion over the driveway and also causing excessive shading over the minimal garden area, and rooms in the house. Fear of failure onto shared driveway and also close proximity to the power lines. T2: Maple- Fell to ground level. If left behind, the tree would become very one sided, as well as still causing excessive shading on garden and house. The tree is also starting to impede the growth of a Lime tree which has been planted in close proximity to it. the Lime has the potential to turn into a nicer specimen, and so removing the Maple would allow it the best chance to do so.

New House High Street Twyford Hampshire SO21 1RG

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04112/TCA | Received: Mon 05 Sep 2022 | Validated: Mon 05 Sep 2022 | Status: No Objection

Reduce Lime (T1) by 1.5m & Copper Beech (T2) by 1m, taking secondary and tertiary branches only. Trees will be left in a natural and balanced shape. Carrying out work as trees are growing over property and casting a large shadow over back garden. Work is being carried out as part of an ongoing maintenance plan.
(Amended)

16 Northfields Cottages Northfields Twyford Hampshire SO21 1NZ

Ref. No: SDNP/22/03459/TPO | Received: Fri 22 Jul 2022 | Validated: Fri 22 Jul 2022 | Status: Approved

Single Storey Side & Rear Extension

1 Hazeley Farm Cottages Hazeley Road Twyford Hampshire SO21 1QA

Ref. No: SDNP/22/03028/HOUS | Received: Tue 28 Jun 2022 | Validated: Tue 28 Jun 2022 | Status: Approved

Replacement of front ground floor window, and increased glazing of front bay window in crittall style. Additional hard landscaping to front to create level threshold.

Nutfield 3 The Crescent Twyford Hampshire SO21 1NL

Ref. No: SDNP/22/02993/HOUS | Received: Fri 24 Jun 2022 | Validated: Fri 01 Jul 2022 | Status: Approved

Erection of open fronted oak framed double garage

Woodland Drove, Springfield Main Road Twyford Moors Hampshire SO21 1EX

Ref. No: SDNP/22/01016/HOUS | Received: Fri 25 Feb 2022 | Validated: Fri 25 Feb 2022 | Status: Approved

Single storey flat roofed extension to rear of property together with internal alterations.

The Cobblers Cottage Queen Street Twyford SO21 1QG

Ref. No: SDNP/22/00336/HOUS | Received: Tue 25 Jan 2022 | Validated: Thu 27 Jan 2022 | Status: Approved

Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 in relation to applicaiton SDNP/19/03892/HOUS

The Stables, Toms Coach House Shawford Road Shawford SO21 2BP

Ref. No: SDNP/21/02129/DCOND | Received: Fri 16 Apr 2021 | Validated: Fri 16 Apr 2021 | Status: Approved

Applications Validated in September 2022

Apple tree - prune no more than 3m. (Fig tree from email granted under 5 day notice but prune later in year 2-3m)

Bridge Lodge Finches Lane Twyford Winchester Hampshire SO21 1QF

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04294/TCA | Received: Mon 12 Sep 2022 | Validated: Mon 12 Sep 2022 | Status: Pending Consideration

Variation of condition 2 of permission SDNP/22/02144/HOUS-Ground floor side/front extension, internal refurbishment and reconfiguration throughout. Glazing alterations and changes to external materials and landscaping. Construction of new storage outbuilding. Amendments to the approved drawings.

Cobham House High Street Twyford Hampshire SO21 1RG

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04237/CND | Received: Fri 09 Sep 2022 | Validated: Fri 09 Sep 2022 | Status: Pending Consideration

T1 magnolia - The tree is touching the house and is growing to big for the area it is in. 1-2m back from building on the northern laterals and 2-3m off the high. The tree was suppressed by recently removed conifers so no pruning required on southern aspect.

5 Segars Lane Twyford Hampshire SO21 1QJ

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04192/TCA | Received: Thu 08 Sep 2022 | Validated: Mon 12 Sep 2022 | Status: No Objection

T1: Maple- Fell to ground level. T2: Maple- Fell to ground level.

New House High Street Twyford Hampshire SO21 1RG

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04112/TCA | Received: Mon 05 Sep 2022 | Validated: Mon 05 Sep 2022 | Status: No Objection

Discharge of condition 6 of permission SDNP/17/02639/FUL- Redevelopment of part of an existing commercial site, comprising the demolition of existing buildings in employment use and the erection of new replacement buildings in B1 & B8 use (and ancillary food kiosk), parking, circulation, landscaping and associated works.

Hazeley Enterprise Park Hazeley Road Twyford Hampshire SO21 1QA

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04096/DCOND | Received: Fri 02 Sep 2022 | Validated: Fri 02 Sep 2022 | Status: Pending Consideration

Discharge of condition 12 of permission SDNP/20/01416/FUL- Proposed detached replacement dwelling (Amended plans received 9/11/20)

28 Churchfields Twyford Hampshire SO21 1NN

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04073/DCOND | Received: Thu 01 Sep 2022 | Validated: Thu 01 Sep 2022 | Status: Pending Consideration

Conversion of existing facilities building to one bedroom holiday let and Replacement of three yurts with one one-bedroom and one two-bedroom holiday let

The Sanctuary Manor Farm Green Twyford Hampshire SO21 1RA

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04058/FUL | Received: Wed 31 Aug 2022 | Validated: Wed 31 Aug 2022 | Status: Pending Consideration

Redevelopment of site with approximately 10,000sqm of new commercial floorspace (full) and an 80 bed care home (outline) following demolition of feed mill, associated agricultural buildings and commercial buildings

Northfields Mill Humphrey Farm Hazeley Road Twyford Winchester Hampshire SO21 1QA

Ref. No: SDNP/22/04047/PRE | Received: Mon 15 Aug 2022 | Validated: Tue 23 Aug 2022 | Status: Pending Consideration

Consultee Comments for Planning Application SDNP/22/04058/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: SDNP/22/04058/FUL

Address: The Sanctuary Manor Farm Green Twyford Hampshire SO21 1RA

Proposal: Conversion of existing facilities building to one bedroom holiday let and Replacement of three yurts with one one-bedroom and one two-bedroom holiday let

Case Officer: Lisa Booth

Consultee Details

Name: Mr J.P. Matthews (Clerk to Twyford Parish Council)

Address: Twyford Parish Council, PO Box 741, Twyford Moors Winchester, Winchester SO23 3QA

Email: Not Available

On Behalf Of: Parish Council Consultee

Comments

Preliminary

Twyford Parish Council (TPC) is aware that each planning application must be considered on its merits; however in this case the merits include the status of the land and the use to which it has been put up to now. In view of the past breaches ,TPC will also urge the Planning Authority to ensure that , if consent is granted, the conditions secure both compliance and a framework for controlling further development, as this application appears a stepping stone to further building and uses, and is only for holiday lodges.

TPC also notes the objectors suspicions that the application is not what it seems and that the intentions of the applicant are different from what is applied for . TPC understands this widespread view and the reasons for it.

TPC notes the following:

Only two of the five yurts have ever been erected

The site does not appear to operate as a holiday site

Booking is obscure

The shower facilities block is fitted out and appears to be used as a dwelling

Consequently, one of the main reasons for the grant of consent namely the holiday/recreational use has not happened. The applicants have however claimed that their consent has been kept alive even though not made use of. They have not explained their reasons. The whole justification for SDLP Policy xx and TNP ST1 for granting consent outside the settlement boundary is to meet the needs of visitors to the national park. The same arguments are used in support of this

application.

On the Policy front TPC has recently completed the Twyford neighbourhood plan; during this process the council discussed its policy for holiday accommodation outside the settlement boundary in detail and notes the inspectors the independent examiners careful re phrasing of its original wording and LH lowan

Taking all of this into account TPCs approach is as follows:

- 1 to query the current planning status of the land
- 2 to examine the policy .
- 3 to look at the details of the application

The appearance of the land

this triangular parcel of land required by the applicant father about 20 years ago was originally part of the fields to the South stop since then the land has been progressively developed and various plantings have taken place, new hedging to the South, a pond now in the western corner a log store now fitted out and apparently used as a dwelling with paved terrace, two concrete bases for yurts, with yurts erected, a small gravelled parking area for three or so cars, and various plantings and mowed areas. The area to the north is largely long grass or wildflower mix; it has some fruit trees and mowed paths. The whole area has the appearance of amenity land. The land is not in agricultural use. The land does not appear to be in regular use apart from the log store/shower block, which appears to be lived in by Mr Strange. The facilities block as seen by three members of the Parish Council on 3rd October, was not fitted out as a facility building but as a home and to be in use.

The Planning status of the Land

The planning status of the land was set by the decisions of the planning inspector in 2012 in which he quashed an enforcement notice for the one yurt and granted planning consent for 5 yurts (which included the one yurt . This was subject to number of conditions, - eight for the deemed application brackets (Annex 1 of the decision letter) and ten for the planning consent (Annex 2) TPC have not been able to find out whether these conditions have been complied with, - either what plans were submitted or when the planning authority might have given its consent or any evidence of the requirements of the conditions being complied with. The importance here is that these details (landscaping, fencing, lighting etc) should provide the basis for any further . One example is Condition 3 of Annex 1 and Condition 5 of annex 2) require fencing to the pond and to the boundaries. There is no fencing to the pond or any fencing to separate the yurt site from the residue of the land.

Perhaps even more fundamental is that three of the conditions in Annex one and four in Annex 2 are conditions precedent i.e. they have to be complied with before any of the yurts or the building is occupied. As has been mentioned TPC can see no sign of the conditions having been complied with, the consequence being that neither of the appeal consents including the conversion of the

log store to ancillary shower and washing facilities are now valid. The site therefore does not have the benefit of planning consent for the uses claimed in the supporting planning statement. Clearly, if the applicant is able to show that the conditions have been properly complied with, this aspect of TPCs comments falls away.

If however the Conditions precedent have not been complied with, there is no valid consent. The issue to be decided by the Planning Authority is then what are the lawful uses and structures on the site?. As this question has to be answered on the basis of fact and law and not on the Development Plan policies , it requires a separate approach from that presented in the current application.

Normally such a determination might be straightforward after such a long period assuming the use consented in 2012 had been implemented and therefore become established . However, in this case, the applicant has failed to erect three of the yurts in the 10 year period since the grant of consent. Moreover, the Sanctuary does not appear to be being used as a holiday site. Residents and neighbours see none of the comings and goings associated with active holiday site. It is not clear that this has ever been a bona fides holiday site providing holiday accommodation. For instance, currently, the renting of a yurt is not available by any of the normal ways of booking. It is doubtful that the holiday use ever been commenced.

To conclude on this aspect of the current application, all of these matches are important in their own right. If the appeal decisions conditions precedent have not being complied with, the original consent is become null and void. The use of the site will have to be determined on the basis of fact and law. As this planning application for making permanent the temporary holidays structures are based in a large part on the validity of the current use and its establishment as a holiday site, much of the supporting argument for the granting of consent is falls away.

TPC requests that these issues are clarified before the current application is considered any further.

Twyford Parish Council

Is the Application in accordance with Policy?

The proposed development is for the erection and conversion of buildings for tourist accommodation with continued seasonal use for 2 yurts. The proposal is: outside the Settlement boundary; in a gap between settlements; adjacent to the Twyford Conservation area; close to a group of dominant listed buildings; within a landscape with historic features; contiguous to residential development ; occupies a small site between residential and large-scale farm buildings in active use; it is adjacent to public footpaths.

Similar development is currently being proposed to the north of the B3335 15 m from this site and the owner's land.

The policies that apply in this case are:

1. Development outside the settlement boundary TNP ST1; ST2; SDLP ST 25
2. Tourism accommodation TNP ST1 and SDLP 23
3. Development in Gaps between settlements: TNP LHE 1 and SDLP 4.
3. Conservation areas TNP
4. LHE 3 and CA/LHE 2; SDLP SD72 and Twyford Conservation Area 1986
5. Listed buildings TNP LHE 3; SDLP SD 71
6. Historic landscape TNP LHE3; SDLP SD 12
7. Landscape Character TNP LHE 2 SDLP SD 46
8. Public footpaths SDLP 20
9. Requirement to consider proposals in combination SDLP SD 1.3
10. Duty of LPA to "foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Park". Environment Act 1995 para 62

1 and 2: Tourism and the Countryside

The applicant states in the Planning Design and Access statement that the SDLP SD 23 is the most important policy. It goes on to claim, firstly, that the site is already confirmed as a tourist location by virtue of the previous consents and, secondly, that it meets the test set in SD23 of being closely associated with the public rights of way network.

TPC's response to the first point is that the status of the planning consent is disputed. The test of being closely associated with the public rights of way network would appear to be an absurdly easy one to pass as there are public rights of way scattered throughout the National Park, - some close to settlements and others in the most remote parts. It would be absurd to conclude that simply relying on SD23 1 g. iv would justify a proposal for tourist accommodation, whether for many units or just one.

The potential for random development in sensitive locations in the countryside is demonstrated by these two Twyford applications (the other being SDNP/22/02180/FUL) on adjacent fields currently before the council. Both use TNP as SDLP 23.g.ii as their primary justification. TNP ST 1 is in line and follows SDLP 23. TPC believes additional criteria is required to enable this policy to be applied without causing material harm to the natural beauty of the National Park.

Fortunately, both SDLP and TNP include safeguards which allow the Planning Authority to permit the tourist accommodation policies to be applied positively without these harmful effects, as follows. The principal policies for development outside the settlement boundary are SB2 in the TNP and SD25 in SDLP. Both these policies allow development outside the settlement boundaries when it is with other policies of the respective plans. However, this is subject to the overriding requirement that this should only be “**Exceptional**”. This is an additional test as SDLP SD 25.2 makes clear with the use of “**and**” in SD25.2. TNP SD 2 follows SDLP SD 25. TPC notes that the submissions of the applicant do not address this additional requirement.

“Exceptional” is not defined by SDLP or TNP. TPC suggests that the tests to decide whether the case is truly “exceptional” should be:

- A. demonstration of need - in line with SD25.2 and TNP SB.2 (b)
- B. community acceptability following consultation - to meet Statutory duty imposed by Environment Act 1995 para 62 b. (as quoted above)
- C. positive benefit for landscape - to meet statutory duty to enhance Natural Beauty of the National Park
- D. conformity with other Development Plan policies should be positive not marginal.

These tests are, of course, in addition to the multiple other tests set by the policies of the TNP read in conjunction with the SDLP.

A Demonstration of Need

The application contains no evidence of need or even of any tourism activity on the site. To justify the intensification of the 5-yurt use, TPC would have expected evidence of unmet demand, but none is forthcoming. The applicant claims that the yurt consent is not viable as explaining his failure to erect three of the five yurts in the past 10 years, but no figures are given in support. Andrew Johnson’s well-presented objection points out the inconsistencies and lack of evidence. The application does not explain why the yurts do not produce sufficient income to cover costs. Neighbours comment on the complete absence of customers over many years either. The lack of promotional advertising is noted by neighbours in their objections and TPC can find only one photograph of the site on the web but without access to make a booking or the contact details of the site owner.

As Andrew Jonson points out, the explanation given for the failure to erect 3 of the 5 yurts undermines the justification for the heavy capital expenditure involved in the new build.

TPC’s considers the narrative presented is simply not credible. A business case using figures from the past 10 years should be required with evidence of the marketing undertaken by the applicant and then projections for the proposed development to demonstrate viability.

The objection by Andrew Johnson shows that there are multiple other opportunities within Twyford itself for visitors without the need for additional buildings. There are many opportunities in the settlements close to Twyford which would allow access to the National Park without the need for additional accommodation outside the settlement boundary in the highly protected countryside of

the SDNP. Further work is required to demonstrate why the existing supply in Twyford and outside the National Park supply is inadequate.

No exceptional case has been made.

B. Community Acceptability

It is unusual for there to be so many objections to a proposal and for those objections to be supported by such a wide range of arguments including suspicion of the motives of the applicant. It is notable also that similar numbers of objections are submitted for the application (SDNP/22/02180/FUL) at Hare Lane for Eco lodges and the conversion of stables. Neither application is popular. In this case many base their objections on the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan; the TNP provides multiple opportunities for development both in the settlement boundary and in the countryside, but its priority, as required by the statutory duty for National Parks, is the preservation of natural beauty.

In the TNP, a suite of policies set the framework for this protection, in line with the Statutory Policies of the SDLP. The TNP has always had the social and economic interests of the local community as its focus and it enjoyed substantial community support in the Parish Referendum where 83% voted in favour. It is these same people who see this application to be contrary to its carefully worked strategy of balance between development and protection.

The Planning Authority should not permit his application in the face of such clear community opposition; it cannot be said to foster the social wellbeing of the Twyford Community and will have the opposite effect.

C. Positive Impact on the Landscape.

D. Positive response to Conformity with other Policies

These are addressed in the consideration of the other policies below.

The conclusion is that several of the impacts are negative and even where strict conformity to a policy can be shown it is at the best being “neutral” in the planning balance and not positive.

The application cannot be said to be **exceptional** on these tests. In the absence of any other justification from the applicant to address this fundamental policy, the application should be refused.

Missing key information in application

The application is missing key information

- Analysis of context, surrounding uses
- Identification of historic landscape /Heritage statement
- “In combination” effects
- Landscaping proposals and details require by the Appeals inspector in 2012, including definition of site boundary by fencing

- The status of the residue of the land
- Full analysis of the Policy position

The Context, Surrounding Uses and Historic Landscape and Heritage

The Sanctuary site occupies approximately 0.95 ha on the southern edge of the village, with the yurt area comprising approx. one quarter of this, A paddock /amenity land occupies the majority of the site and a pond in the narrow bottom corner . This is the extent of the applicant’s ownership. To the south is an arable field separated by a well-used fenced public footpath; this links across B3335 to Hare Lane and a network of further paths.

Adjacent to the site is Manor Farm Green, which was planned as a whole to secure the preservation and future use of the historic listed Manor Farm. The farm itself forms part of a larger group together with the listed Manor House and Monastery (private houses) all grouped in a rectangular block dating from Elizabethan times or earlier; it is an exceptional group of historic buildings, reflecting its unified ownership and function and retaining its historic relationship with the agricultural land to the south. The whole complex is within the Twyford Conservation Area. The preservation of the barn was financed by the redevelopment of the modern farm buildings into housing. The layout followed the footprint of the farm buildings, and a further pair of houses was added to the Victorian terrace of farm cottages. This resulted in an attractive layout with design purpose which is clearly evident and respected the form of the buildings they replaced. Since this development that took place about 20 years ago, there has been no other housing in the vicinity nor has there been any substantial modification of the manor farm designs.

Manor Farm is at the entry to the village as it has been since probably before 1570. There is a sharp division between the built form of the village and the countryside, so the first impression on entry into the village is of the group of Manor Farm buildings dominated by the great barn. It is a dramatic entry, and its survival is also unusual. It is also seen by every user of the B3335, so is of exceptional visibility. The access to the Yurt site is through Manor Farm Green (and through the Twyford Conservation area); the new buildings are so close as to be visually a continuation of the Manor Farm Buildings. Clearly they do not complement them and instead appear to be random buildings with no coordinated design as the landscape officer notes and judges to be contrary to policy.

None of this is acknowledged by the application nor taken as the starting point for how they are designed. Consequently they fail to comply with SD23 1 c and the range of supporting policies from the protection and enhancement of natural beauty in TNP and SDLP.

[NOTE: The Landscape officer’s comments appear to leave out a crucial ‘not’ which is needed to make sense of their conclusions. The excerpt is as follows with the missing ‘not’ in square brackets: “Whilst some quantum of development would seem to be possible to replace the yurts (notwithstanding other planning considerations), the drawings presented do [not] show a scheme that appears to respond well to the situation or fully takes account of views from the surroundings and therefore not fully meet policy as shown above.”]

At present the Sanctuary land is shut off behind gates and hedges; this is because it is not actively used as a holiday site. The site is bound to become more open if the development is constructed and

the holiday use commenced. The gates will be removed or left open, the access widened the car park extended to a proper size and the buildings will be much taller. [See further comments below] They cannot be hidden as the Planning Application and Visual Appraisal appear to suggest. And they should not be; the SDLP and TNP objectives are that new development should enhance the area, not be hidden.

At the end of the lane are farm buildings in active use. The scale of these buildings is large but they are well sited and their bulk is masked by trees and hedges. They stand separated from Manor Farm Green, with a countryside gap between them i.e. the Sanctuary site. The farm buildings despite their scale are an appropriate type of building that you expect to see function in the countryside.

The modern farmyard site is contiguous to the yurt site so needs to take account of this relationship too. At present this is done by the small scale of the yurt, hedging and trees as the farm buildings and the yurts are not on the whole seen together. This will change with the taller buildings and the change in form of the facilities building.

The planning application does not properly acknowledge the significance of the lane which is the continuation of Manor Farm Green giving access to the modern farmyard and the meadows on the valley floor. There is no note on it in either the Landscape appraisal or the Ecologists otherwise very full report. This is an ancient lane, dominated on its north side by a number of fully mature oaks. There are hedges on both sides. To the north the hedge is fully intact and contains a wide variety of woody plants which further indicate its antiquity. The hedge to the south is in poor condition; elm which has died from the Dutch Elm disease has been replaced by bramble. It still in its original position; the western end has been replanted already: the restoration of the remainder would re-establish the historic and landscape integrity of the lane as well as providing a better visual screen to the development.

It must be borne in mind that the countryside is being radically changed as the result of various tree pandemics, most recently ash die back which affects approx. 90% of ash both young and mature. Wholesale felling of affected trees has resulted in the loss of screening on which many developments rely. This is another matter for the landscape plan assessment to take into account.

There is a small historic Toll Gate cottage at the SE tip of the Sanctuary and a small farm shed beyond. Otherwise this part of the countryside gap is without buildings. North of B3335, the land is in horsiculture and agriculture. There is a free range chicken farm with long low buildings and consent for a house. There is an application to build eco lodges and modify the horse stables on the horsiculture land which is currently being considered. The field is to change from horse to leisure use. The buildings will be visible from vantage points including B3335. Upgrading of the access is to be expected with some removal of trees.

The site is adjacent to the strategic gap between Colden Common and Twyford defined and protected by LHE1; this site is also within that same gap and is subject to the definition of Landscape character in SDLP SD 3. Which reads:

“The settlement pattern and individual identity of settlements and the integrity of predominantly open and undeveloped land between settlements will not be undermined”

TPC 's consider that this application will do exactly what SD3 is seeking to prevent, both on its own and in conjunction with the eco lodge proposals north of B3335.

The application: unresolved issues between plans, the Description, and Operation

The Plans

- are not consistent with the description; the plans show “ 1 x bed ; 1 x2 bed; 1 x 3 bed. See Andrew Johnson representation
- create confusion as to whether Lodge 2 is 1 x 3 bed or 1x1 bed plus 1x 2 bed. See Andrew Johnson representation
- do not explain the odd configuration of Lodge 2 with a 25 m courtyard and a hall dividing the unit into two.
- wish to convert the Facilities Building into accommodation but do not show anywhere the occupants of the two yurts are expected to shower wash or w/c. There is no replacement for the existing facilities/storage space. Will this be applied for later?
- show inadequate parking and turning. The Application form indicates 6 spaces. The parking areas currently measures approx. 10 m by 15 m approached through inward opening double doors; the plans do not show the turning on site. It is not clear that this number can be achieved and allow for turning. In any case 6 spaces seems inadequate for three units (or four) with 5 bed spaces plus the two retained yurts. The numbers of cars allowed for should be reassessed, to include service vehicles and visitors; the capacity of the area provided should be tested to demonstrate the feasibility of the layout, to include turning. If as seems likely, additional space is required , the layout should be amended. The principle of a single access to the site and a single parking area should be retained to avoid cars spilling out over the whole site with associated works and hard standings. The enlarged car parking area is likely to affect the siting of Lodge 2.
- There is no provision for cycles.
- do not show how the site will operate, e.g. paths to the units , private vs common space
- do not show boundary treatments, lighting, landscape proposals although detailed recommendations are made in the Ecologists report.
- do not explain why a large dormer window is needed for a storage area (the facilities building). The implication is that a bedroom is intended.
- provides no details of drainage or waste disposal . This is a serious omission since the site is close to the River Itchen SAC as the Ecologists reports notes but the Application form does not. The concern of Southern Water in ensuring that effluent from housing in Twyford is properly handled so as not to affect the River Itchen is shown in the condition attached to the housing site allocated in the village centre see TNP DB1.I.
- give no details of nitrate emissions or proposed mitigation in accordance with TNP PO1
- do not include the proposed change of use of the remainder of the site (0.6 ha) approx. from agriculture to amenity land to be used in association with the holiday accommodation.
- do not provide an adequate framework for the further development to which this application seems likely to lead (e.g. provision of replacement facilities building; replacement of one or more yurts with holiday dwelling; infill of courtyard to enlarge Lodge 2)

This is a formidable list of omissions and uncertainties which should be clarified before the application is considered any further. At present the Parish Council has an incomplete picture of what is proposed so cannot properly assess the impact. If the plans are amended then there should be a further round of consultation.

The Design.

The proposals are for five structures with four radically different designs,- two yurts, one modified woodstore, one two storey building with a curved roof and one with a ridged two storey element. None of these structures relate to either of the two sets of buildings on either side, - the farm complex and Manor Farm Green. Four of the buildings are set in the circle designed for the yurts. The circle of yurts had some coherence; they were five identical units, with strong simple shapes forming a sort of camp. However the substitution of buildings for yurts destroys this coherence. It creates instead a random assortment of buildings with no special countryside connection. Even the log store/facilities building which is a simple farm shape is modified with a dormer which turns it into a suburban bungalow so all are unrelated and unsympathetic both to each other and to their surroundings. The juxtaposition of yurts to this assortment of newbuild is also bizarre and appears a stepping stone to its replacement with a further buildings.

Contrary to the claim of the applicant, the application fails the tests in SD23 d and g.i.

The Landscape Officers comments set the design failures out very clearly.

Bad neighbour

Holiday units may be bad neighbours to residential from regular outdoor partying especially in the summer months. Here the holiday use is immediately adjacent to residential property.

The proposed holiday use is also at risk from disturbance from normal farm operations.

Summary

This is an application which does not seem to be what it is claimed to be. There are a significant number of anomalies contained within the application and which has resulted in much local opposition.

The site is not an established tourist site and that the 2012 consent may have lapsed. Even if the consent is valid, the consent has never been implemented in full and the field has not operated either fully or regularly as a normal tourist site, if at all. The explanation for not erecting the yurts also undermines the viability of the new build.

There is no evidence of need for these holiday units; Andrew Johnson demonstrates there are ample opportunities to secure accommodation for holiday makers within the settlement boundaries nor has a business case been made.

The Facilities Building gives every appearance to be an occupied dwelling. It is fitted out, fully stocked and furnished as a dwelling with a kitchen, sitting room and bedroom. Neighbours have

complained to Planning Enforcement over time that it is being lived in by the former applicant, the father of the present applicant.

The conditions imposed on the 2012 consents have not been carried out particularly safety issues around the pond.

The proposals themselves lie outside the settlement boundary which is subject to a suite of policies to protect it as gap, countryside, historic landscape and proximity to SAC. These policies are considered only negatively as constraint by the application, not in the positive spirit in which they were prepared.

There are serious shortcomings in the plans submitted for the buildings that create confusion about the intention of the applicant and prevent a full picture of the proposals being formed by consultees and the public.

The proposals do not respond to the character of the area and will cause harm because of visibility, because they will be higher and permanent (unlike the seasonal erection of the yurts).

The Application relies primarily on TNP ST1 and SDLP 23 in particular 1.g; other policies apply. The application does not attempt to address the requirement of SD 25 to be "exceptional"; the case is not exceptional as set out above.

The proposals are adjacent to buildings in conservation area, close to listed building and to a carefully designed group of buildings to which it does not relate nor properly consider. Nor do the buildings relate well to each other and are a random set of four differing designs, to which the Landscape officer has rightly pointed out the conflict with policy.

The application should be considered in combination with SDNP/22/02180/FUL, the conversion of the stables and eco lodges currently before the council on the adjacent land across the B3335. These are for the same tourist use with radically differing designs and randomly located in the countryside and gap between settlements. If both are permitted it will create a major change of use to leisure and a "honey pot" with unexplored consequences that could alter the character of the area.

The application should be refused and the status of the 2012 consent examined to see if enforcement action should be taken to regularise or discontinue the current use.