

# UPDATE PAPER

## Southern Area Planning Committee

**Date:** Tuesday, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2022

**Time:** 5.30 p.m

**Venue:** Main Hall, Crosfield Hall, Broadwater Road, Romsey,  
Hampshire, SO51 8GL

**Southern Area Planning Committee – 1<sup>st</sup> November 2022  
Update Paper**

The purpose of the report is to provide information on planning applications which has been received since the agenda was printed.

Report of Head of Planning

**1. Background**

- 1.1 Reports on planning applications are prepared for printing on the agenda some 10 days before the date of the Committee meeting but information and representations received after that time are relevant to the decision. This paper contains such information which was received before 10.00am on the date of the meeting. Any information received after that time is reported verbally.

**2. Issues**

- 2.1 Information and representations are summarized but the full text is available on the relevant file should Members require more details. The paper may contain an officer comment on the additional information, amended recommendations and amended and/or additional conditions.

7. **20/02385/FULLS (PERMISSION) 11.12.2020** **10 - 60**  
SITE: Hill Farm Caravan Park, Branches Lane,  
Sherfield English, SO51 6FH, **SHERFIELD ENGLISH**

**CASE OFFICER:** Graham Melton

8. **22/02176/FULLS (PERMISSION) 25.08.2022** **61 - 92**  
SITE: 109A Winchester Road, Romsey, Hampshire,  
SO51 8JF, **ROMSEY TOWN**

**CASE OFFICER:** Sarah Barter

7. **22/02223/FULLS (PERMISSION) 30.08.2022** **93 - 98**  
SITE: Campsie Glen, Sandy Lane, Abbotswood,  
SO51 0PD, **ROMSEY EXTRA**

**CASE OFFICER:** Katie Savage

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	20/02385/FULLS
<b>SITE</b>	Hill Farm Caravan Park, Branches Lane, Sherfield English, SO51 6FH, <b>SHERFIELD ENGLISH</b>
<b>COMMITTEE DATE</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> November 2022
<b>ITEM NO.</b>	7
<b>PAGE NO.</b>	10 – 60

---

**1.0 VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 A viewing panel was held on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> October with Councillors Bailey, Bundy, Gidley and Jeffrey. Apologies were received from Councillors Burnage, Cooper, A. Dowden, C. Dowden, Johnston, Maltby, Parker and Warnes.

**2.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

2.1 Since the publication of the agenda report, an additional 5 letters of objection have been received, summarised as follows:

Ecology

- Completely agree with the Gooding's analysis of the occupancy of the site, to accept the applicant's version is ridiculous.
- Concerned about the occupancy figures and projections
- Very concerned about the environmental impact of underestimates for waste disposal and also the impact on the locality on water supply and pressure in the area which is low.
- Occupancy figures is seriously flawed predict 2.5 people for 3 double bedroom lodge but 2.65 people for the current touring caravan units.
- Observations of application site over recent days appear to undermine the reported figures provided by the applicant.
- Simple site neutral number of static caravans is 51, not 80 – the proposal is too intensive.

Principle of development

- NPPF, Local Plan.
- Proposal is counter to the Village Design Statement and the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- The Neighbourhood Development Plan has been out to several rounds of public consultation.
- Loss in more affordable touring pitches.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

- Design, Character of Area, Over Development.
- Trees.
- The site should now be assessed as a housing estate, to allow it to be open all year means it will be lived in all year round.
- Given the design of the 'chalets', which are actually more like small houses, the density of housing on this site is unacceptable in Sherfield English.

- Impact not only along Branches Lane but also Doctors Hill, a single track road with 24 residential properties.
- Currently the white caravans are towed off between the end of October and March.
- Development is out of character for rural area of dispersed housing, urbanisation with major environmental implications.
- The proposal will result in an anomaly at the northern end of Doctors Hill of 80 densely packed static caravans, will create a significantly more dense barracks-style arrangement.
- The lodges will remain in situ permanently, not even giving the current winter respite.
- The proposed landscaping plan with the units slightly offset is not reassuring, until a proper plan of the full, rearranged site can be presented for discussion.
- Insufficient space onsite for proposed units and landscaping.

#### Impact on the amenity of residential property

- Noise, scale and bulk result in loss of light.

#### Impact on the general amenity of the area

- Previous online reviews mention site overcrowding and problems with the toilets and sewerage smells.

#### Highways

- Traffic Generation, Parking and Safety.

#### Conditions/Restrictions

##### *Use*

- Do not see the safeguards to ensure these will be holiday homes rather than residential units in the future which would have required closer planning scrutiny and development of infrastructure.
- Number of static caravan units should be restricted to a site neutral number of 51.
- Caravan units should be closed to visitors for 4 months per year.

##### *Landscape*

- Landscaping to be put in place prior to lodges being installed onsite.
- Boundary planting to be increased and lodges to be moved away from site boundaries.
- Suggested that it would be clearer and therefore more effective to stipulate a minimum distance of the units from boundaries with reference to fixed points.
- Use of DPC trigger point for conditions 12 and 13 is not appropriate.
- Maintenance period in condition 14 should be longer than the stated 5 years.

##### *Design and ecology*

- Details of design of caravan 'lodges' to require prior approval.

- All external lighting to highest 'dark skies' and bat friendly standards.
- Condition 18 on external lighting should include reference to bat conservation trust.
- Biodiversity enhancements should be provided prior to Planning Committee not submitted post decision.
- No skylights on static caravan units to reduce light spill.

#### *Foul drainage provision*

- Waste water treatment to be appropriate for maximum visitor numbers.

#### Other matters

- Please also consider the motivation of the owners of the existing camp site, which is to get planning permission then to leave the area with a very tidy profit.
- Similar lodges at Greenhill farm, Landford sell for up to £300,00 each.
- Concerned about the impact on the farmland adjacent to the residential property known as The Old Quarry.
- Application includes outdated information regarding the wellbeing centre, likely no longer in regular public use.
- Low occupancy were to be realised, then the majority of business for the post office and shop would still come from local permanent residents and not rely on major development.

2.2 Set out below is the officer commentary on those matters raised within the additional representation letters:

#### 2.3 Ecology

##### *Calculation of overall visitor numbers*

Paragraphs 8.50 to 8.84 (pages 33 to 39) set out the methodology undertaken for the calculation of overall visitor numbers for the existing operation and the proposed development. This calculation supported the most recent Appropriate Assessment.

2.4 To expand on the commentary provided in the agenda report, the summary data set provided by the applicant included a breakdown of different occupancy averages recorded for the period 2010 to 2021 for different types of accommodation. This is available to view as tab B of Appendix 2 of the most recent Appropriate Assessment.

2.5 In recognition that there is no direct comparable to the proposed lodges currently onsite, it was identified that the existing 3 bed static caravans onsite represents the closest type of existing accommodation to the proposed lodges. This is due to both the number of bedrooms available within the static caravans and the fact that unlike touring caravans and tents, the static caravans remain onsite all year round rather than removed on a seasonal basis.

2.6 In acknowledgement of the limited size of the dataset and that the proposed lodges are likely to be of greater scale than the existing static caravans, the highest recorded average was taken forward as the occupancy rate for the

proposed lodges. This was a figure of 2.5 people per unit recorded in 2016.

- 2.7 It is noted that the outcome of this exercise is the identification of a proposed occupancy per unit (2.5 people) lower than the occupancy rate for the existing accommodation (2.65 people) and the total bedrooms within a 3 bed unit. However, even in the event that an average of 2.65 people was applied to the proposed lodges then there overall result will still be a net reduction in overall numbers (with the identified deficit reduced from 1,036 per yer to 583 per year).
- 2.8 The identified figure of 2.5 people is also higher than average household size of 2.4 people reported in Natural England's guidance document which is derived from census data. A proportion of the households that inform this average reside in properties with greater bedroom numbers than people. It is therefore not considered unreasonable to assume that an increase in size of the proposed lodges when compared to existing static caravans and tents pitches, will not automatically result in an increase in occupancy rates, on the basis that the raw booking data for 3 bedroom static caravan demonstrate that this is not the case.
- 2.9 It is recognised that the approach undertaken in the most recent Appropriate Assessment has evolved since previous Appropriate Assessments. The original Appropriate Assessment undertaken referred to data generated by tourism industry surveys and in particular the 2012 British Holidays and Homes for occupancy per unit rates as well as the 2019 Great Britain Tourism Survey for seasonal occupancy rates.
- 2.10 On the matter of occupancy rates per unit, the following dataset was referred to:
- 'The average size of group in all types of accommodation is 3.49 people comprising an average of 2.21 adults and 1.28 children. Groups in privately-owned units average 3 people, in rented static units average 4.82 people and in tourers 3.54 people.'
- 2.11 The original Appropriate Assessment identified took forward an average occupancy per unit of 3.5 people for the existing operation and 3.5 people for the proposed lodges, on the basis that the proposal will deliver a combination of privately owned units and units rented out to third parties.
- 2.12 However, the selection of a particular average to use for a particular type of accommodation is open to interpretation, as the breakdown above does not perfectly correlate with the particular type of accommodation brought onto site currently or the proposed lodges. It is also notable that the averages provided from the tourism surveys referred to above and other available surveys are a collation of data from a variety of different tourism sites in different regions.
- 2.13 Consequently, whilst the use of the raw booking data system in the most recent Appropriate Assessment does not contain data from units of identical scale and design to the proposed lodges, it does represent site specific data which accounts for the locational context of the application site. Where there are gaps in the raw booking data set, then the highest recorded average has been used for occupancy per units. In addition, a combined average for March and October

has been used for the winter months (November, December, January and February). As a result, the calculation undertaken in the most recent Appropriate Assessment has incorporated a degree of overestimation at the points that the raw booking data has been used as a projection of the anticipated visitor levels.

- 2.14 It is acknowledged that alternative calculations submitted by residents, referring to tourism survey data for occupancy averages rather than the averages generated from the raw booking data, demonstrate that the proposed development will result in a significant increase in visitors overall. The consequence of the proposed scheme delivering an increase rather than decrease of overall visitor levels is the requirement for nitrate neutrality and recreational pressure mitigation will be triggered.
- 2.15 However, these calculations are reliant on the tourism survey data and therefore incur the same issues identified above. That is not to say that the tourism survey data are not from reputable sources, but that this alternative calculation method does not resolve the need for a degree of projection in the absence of a dataset that perfectly corresponds to the development proposed and the characteristics of the application site.
- 2.16 Equally an alternative calculation based on the maximum numbers of bedrooms, for example the application of a 3 person occupancy average for 3 bedroom units, is underpinned by an assumption that each bedroom will be occupied by a single person. That assumption does not accord with the Natural England guidance on the calculation for residential dwellings which is calculated by the average household size rather than on the basis of bedroom provision. As such, this alternative approach would also incorporate a degree of projection that varies to the approach undertaken for different types of development.
- 2.17 To conclude, in the absence of site specific data for lodge accommodation and occupancy during winter months, the use of the raw booking data provided by the applicant has been selected by the LPA over the use of tourism survey data. A degree of estimation has been built into the calculation as set out above. It is therefore considered that this approach is reasonable and sufficiently precautionary.
- 2.18 Principle of development  
Third party representations have drawn reference to the NPPF and the Local Plan, but no further details have been provided of specific concerns. The agenda report undertakes an assessment against the relevant policies of the Local Plan and NPPF. The comment regarding the loss of affordable pitches is noted but the affordability of the tourism accommodation proposed is not a requirement of planning policy.
- 2.19 *Neighbourhood Plan*  
Following the publication of the agenda report, the Neighbourhood Planning officer has advised that the Sherfield English has not commenced the Regulation 14 draft plan consultation. As the Neighbourhood Plan has not progressed to the Regulation 16 consultation on a plan to be submitted for examination, then it cannot be afforded significant weight in the determination of



the current planning application.

2.20 *Village Design statement*

As reported at paragraphs 8.29 to 8.31 of the agenda report (page 30), the Sherfield English Village Design statement does not contain any specific guidance relating to the type of development proposed in this instance.

2.21 Impact on the character and appearance of the area

Paragraphs 8.16 to 8.37 (pages 27 to 31) of the agenda report set out the assessment of the impact on the character and appearance of the area.

2.22 It is noted that the lodges are likely to be larger in scale than the existing caravan units and tents. It is also noted that the proposal will result in the appearance of structures onsite all year round rather than the current seasonal operation.

2.23 However, as assessed in the agenda report, the application site benefits from mature vegetation aligning the boundaries with both Branches Lane and Doctors Hill. The proposed scheme includes a landscaping plan with a focus on supplementing the existing vegetation on the western boundary of the application site. The purpose of this planting is to complement the existing vegetation and ensure that the appearance of the proposed lodges is not unduly prominent when viewed from either public highway rather serve to completely screen all views. It is considered that submitted planting details achieves this objective.

2.24 The comments from the landscape officer regarding the proximity of the proposed planting to the proposed pitch areas is noted but it is considered that this can be resolved through onsite maintenance and management of the planting as well as the precise placement of the lodges. It is therefore not considered necessary to stipulate precise distances within the wording of condition no.13 to ensure that the proposal is acceptable in planning terms.

2.25 The imposition of condition no. 13 and the submission of additional planting and other landscaping details is primarily aimed at the landscaping not located on the western boundary of the application site, given the level of detail already provided for this area. However, with the amended wording to the approved documents list specifically set out as condition no. 2 on the agenda report and the subsequent omission of the currently submitted planting plan, there is now the opportunity to revise the current planting species mix and submit final details under the requirements of condition no. 13.

2.26 Furthermore, the separate requirements of the licencing process will ensure that a reasonable separation distance is maintained between the proposed individual units. As a result, it is not considered that the proposal will adversely impact the character and appearance of the area.

2.27 Impact on the amenity of residential property

Reference is made to the impact on the amenity of residential property but no further details are contained within third party representations received since the

publication of the agenda report. Paragraphs 8.113 to 8.116 of the agenda report (pages 44 and 45) have covered matters relating to the impact on the amenity of residential property.

2.28 Impact on the general amenity of the area

*Foul drainage*

Third party representations have identified previous negative complaints regarding the maintenance of foul drainage infrastructure onsite. As noted in paragraph 8.98 (page 42), during instances that the existing foul drainage infrastructure is not operational then there are controls under other legislation, such as the Environment Agency licencing process, to ensure that sufficient foul drainage infrastructure is in place and operational. It is therefore not considered that the identification of previous complaints is a basis for refusing the current application.

2.29 *Overcrowding*

The comment regarding previous overcrowding issues is noted but it is not considered that this serves as a reasonable basis for refusing the proposed development. The spacing of units is a matter for the licencing process and consequently, it is not necessary to impose controls as part of determining the planning application.

2.30 Highways

Reference is made to traffic generation, parking and safety but no further details are contained within third party representations received since the publication of the agenda report. Paragraphs 8.117 to 8.122 of the agenda report (pages 45 and 46) have covered matters relating to highway safety.

2.31 Conditions/restrictions

*Use*

Third party representations have raised concerns that insufficient controls within the officer recommendation to ensure that the proposed development is occupied within the parameters and scope of the current application. However, conditions no. 5 and no. 6 on the officer recommendation prohibit the occupation of the proposed lodges for any other purpose than as tourism accommodation and ensure that a log of visitors will be maintained. It is therefore considered that sufficient controls are in place for the Local Planning Authority to investigate and enforce any potential breach of planning control.

2.32 *Landscape*

In acknowledgement of the concerns raised within third party representations, the trigger points for conditions 12 and 13 have been amended to avoid reference to damp proof course. In relation to the 5 year maintenance period as referred to within condition no. 14, this is the standard timeframe for ensuring the establishment of the proposed planting. Should members conclude that a 5 year period is insufficient in this particular instance then there is the scope to increase the maintenance timeframe.

2.33 The points relating to the relationship between the proposed planting and location of the proposed lodges has been addressed in the section on character

and appearance of the area above.

2.34 *Design and ecology*

As set out in section 3 of the agenda report, the proposed lodges do not form part of the planning application and it is therefore not possible to impose conditions relating to their appearance or prevent the provision of skylights.

2.35 The submitted survey work has identified opportunities for the provision of biodiversity enhancements and consequently, it is not considered necessary to secure the precise details of the biodiversity enhancements prior to determination of the planning application. With regard to external lighting details secured by the imposition of condition no. 18, on receipt of any submission the ecologist will be consulted and an assessment against best practice guidance will be undertaken. It is therefore not considered necessary to specifically refer to Bat Trust guidance within the condition wording.

2.36 *Foul drainage provision*

As the existing foul drainage provision is to be retained, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to impose conditions relating to the existing package treatment plants. In the event that this infrastructure is not functioning sufficiently, then other controls over the licensing process are available to the Local Authority.

2.37 Other Matters

*Motivation of the applicants/monetary value of the proposal*

Third party representations have also raised the issue of the potential monetary value of the proposed development and the applicant's motivations but these issues are not material considerations to the assessment of the planning application.

2.38 *Farmland adjacent to The Old Quarry*

The application site does not include the field directly adjacent to the residential property known as The Old Quarry and therefore, this land does not fall within the scope of the current application.

2.39 *Wellbeing centre/post office/shop*

Concern has been raised that the application includes outdated information regarding the onsite wellbeing centre but the assessment of the planning merits of the proposal as set out in the agenda report is not reliant on information relating to the wellbeing centre in any way.

2.40 Third party representations have commented that the identified reduction in overall visitor numbers arising from the proposed scheme will result in the existing onsite post office and shop being used predominantly local residents. However, the potential impact on the shop and post office as asserted by the appellant has not been tested by officers as it is not a requirement of planning policy.

3.0 **AMENDMENTS**

3.1 Condition 2

The wording of the approved documents condition (no. 2) as set out on page 49 of the agenda report included the planting species schedule for the proposed western boundary landscape planting. However, it is not considered necessary to include this schedule with the approved documents at this stage of the planning process, as there is potential for the final species mix to be amended and approved under condition no. 13.

### 3.2 Conditions 12 and 13

Following the publication of the agenda report third party representations have raised concerns with the original wording of conditions 12 and 13, in particular the use of damp proof course as the trigger point is not appropriate as this does not apply to the type of development proposed. It is acknowledged that the use of damp proof course would not achieve a trigger point applicable to the development type proposed and therefore, the wording of conditions 12 and 13 have been amended to refer to the commencement of works to enable the formation of the proposed tracks and pitches instead. The full wording is set out at section 5 below.

## 4.0 **APPENDICES**

### 4.1 Appendix 1

For ease of reference during the officer's presentation, a plan is attached as Appendix 1 identifying the different locations that the photographs have been taken from.

## 5.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

### 5.1 **Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building for the completion of a legal agreement to secure the following restrictions:**

- **Replicate the restrictions relating to The Holiday Park, as defined by the previous legal agreement completed under 11/00308/OBLS.**
- **Secure the phasing of the development in accordance with the submitted phasing plan.**

**Then PERMISSION subject to conditions 1, 3-11, 14-18, note 1 per the main agenda report and amended conditions 2, 12 and 13 as set out below.**

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:**

**Revised Site Location Plan  
Amended Landscape Masterplan (Figure 9 Rev P9)  
Soft Landscape Details Sheet 1 of 2  
Soft Landscape Details Sheet 2 of 2**

**Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**

- 12. No works to enable the formation of the tracks and pitches hereby permitted shall take place, until details of a scheme of ecological**

**enhancement measures to be incorporated within the development is submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. All enhancement measures should be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To enhance the biodiversity of the site in accordance with requirements under the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

- 13. Notwithstanding the information provided for the western boundary, no works to enable the formation of the tracks hereby permitted shall take place, until full details of the hard and soft landscape works have been submitted and approved. Details shall include:**

- (i) planting plans;**
- (ii) written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);**
- (iii) schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities;**
- (iv) hard surfacing materials.**

**The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To enable the development to respect, complement and positively integrate into the character of the area in accordance with Policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

20/02385/FULLS Appendix 1

**ArcGIS Web Map**



Date: 31/10/2022

Scale: 1:2,500

Author: Test Valley Borough Council

© Crown copyright and database rights 2022.  
OS 1000024296. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

**APPLICATION NO.** 22/02176/FULLS  
**SITE** 109A Winchester Road, Romsey, SO51 8JF,  
SO51 8JF, **ROMSEY TOWN**  
**COMMITTEE DATE** 01 November 2022  
**ITEM NO.** 8  
**PAGE NO.** 61 - 92

---

**1.0 CONSULTATIONS**

- 1.1 Legal- The s106 agreement relating to application 22/02176/FULLS has now been executed and sealed.
- 1.2 Natural England- With regard to European Sites, Natural England does not object to the granting of this permission subject to all mitigation measures being secured by legal agreement and their strict and timely implementation for the full duration of the development.

**2.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

**Permission subject to conditions 1-20 and notes 1-4 as per the main agenda report.**

**APPLICATION NO.** 22/02223/FULLS  
**SITE** Campsie Glen , Sandy Lane, Abbotswood, SO51 0PD,  
**ROMSEY EXTRA**  
**COMMITTEE DATE** 1 November 2022  
**ITEM NO.** 9  
**PAGE NO.** 93 - 98

---

1.0 **Corrections**

1.1 Planning History

22/01156/FULLS - Single storey rear and two storey side extension with window, door and external wall material alterations. – Withdrawn

1.2 Section 6.5

Existing windows are white and brown

2.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**No Change**