

7. **18/00936/FULLN (PERMISSION/REFUSE) 06.04.2018**

10 – 43

SITE: Bourne Park Airfield, Bourne Park Estate,
HURSTBOURNE TARRANT

CASE OFFICER: Oliver Woolf

APPLICATION NO.	18/00936/FULLN
SITE	Bourne Park Airfield, Bourne Park Estate, Hurstbourne Tarrant, SP11 0DG, HURSTBOURNE TARRANT
COMMITTEE DATE	30 th April 2019
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	10 - 43

1.0 **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

- 1.1 The applicant has provided some further information:
- There is only one full time employee and that has been the case for many years.
 - Any owners of the new house will employ a gardener/groundsman or home help or nanny or possibly all three. There will also be many highly skilled craftsmen building a quality home for the best part of 2 years.
 - In addition the tree and hedge planting will give employment during the planting stage and thereafter for the next 15 years until they are established.
 - This amounts to rather more than the employment status quo and will also bring more cash benefit to the area than the present occupiers ever did.

2.0 **REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 **1 email of support, no address given.**
- Occupiers are in favour of this proposed planning application.

3.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 3.1 At the NAPC meeting speakers mentioned that if there were noise issues from the airfield they complained directly to the airfield rather than to the Council. Various points were also made about engine testing taking place on the ground, including at weekends, and the disturbance this caused. Following the NAPC meeting the applicants were asked if they were able to provide evidence of complaints having been made to them as owners of the airfield. No further information has been submitted by the applicants on this matter. Therefore no evidence has been presented to the LPA that the applicants have received complaints about noise from the airfield in recent years.
- 3.2 The only further information provided by the applicants refers to the number of employees. The applicant suggests that the new dwelling will provide economic and employment benefits compared to the existing use.
- 3.3 Local Plan policies seek to avoid the loss of land currently in employment use to alternative uses which can increase existing problems such as out-commuting and the lack of certain types of employment. The supporting text to policy LE10 in paragraph 6.50 makes this clear, and identifies that in rural areas, such sites may be difficult to replace. The applicant has advised that the existing business would be likely to move out of the Borough should permission be granted for redevelopment of the site. The scheme may result in the loss of a business that has only one full time employee at present, but also the ongoing employment and economic benefits to the local area permanently, with no likelihood of

replacement elsewhere in the Borough.

3.4 The NPPF supports economic growth and sets out an economic objective for the planning system to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy (paragraph 8) and sets out that, *“Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development”* (paragraph 80). Paragraph 82 sets out that, *“Planning policies and decisions should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors”*. The application site is in the countryside and meets the specific locational requirements of this type of employment use, and fulfils a need which is unlikely to be easily met elsewhere.

3.5 The applicant therefore sets out information in relation to number of employees but does not address the matter of principle in hand, that is the loss of employment land and the ongoing importance of economic development for the Borough. The applicant has not sought to make a case that the employment land is no longer required for the economic development needs of the Borough which is a potential case under policy LE10.

3.6 **Planning balance**

As set out in the PCC Agenda report, no evidence is presented as part of the application to demonstrate that noise from the site causes, or could cause significant harm to the character of the area or the amenities of residents. The applicants have not provided any further evidence of complaints or issues raised with them. As such it has not been demonstrated that the proposal complies with criterion b) of policy LE10. It has not been demonstrated that it complies with criteria a) either and as such the proposed loss of the employment site is contrary to policy LE10. Where there is conflict with the development plan it is necessary to consider other material considerations and whether they justify granting permission contrary to the plan.

3.7 Paragraphs 8.42 to 8.44 of the NAPC report and the assessment in the PCC Agenda report set out and assess the benefits of the scheme, including that the construction of the development, the planting and the ongoing occupation of the dwelling will generate employment and benefits to the local economy as well as delivering landscape and biodiversity benefits. These are material considerations which carry weight.

3.8 The landscape and ecological enhancements are considered to carry significant weight. There are anecdotal accounts of noise from the application site and the impacts it has on local residents. However the applicants have not provided any evidence to assess the noise from the site, despite this on occasions apparently being from ground activities. There is no evidence of complaints to the Council about these matters in recent years or of complaints directly to the airfield. The loss of the employment site is likely to result in some reduction of noise, however without evidence to substantiate the degree of impact of the site, and of its removal, this can only be given limited weight.

3.9 It is considered that policy LE10 of the RLP is consistent with national policy in the NPPF and as such can be given full weight. The material considerations in this case demonstrate some benefits from the scheme but it is not considered that these would outweigh the unjustified loss of an employment site and general aviation airfield in a suitable location and the conflict with an up-to-date development plan.

4.0 **RECOMMENDATION**
No change.