

Mr Eaves,

Further to your email to our architect, Phil Hamblin, my wife and I felt compelled to respond before you make your final decision regarding our application for Northney farm.

When considering whether it is appropriate for the change of use, the guidance states that a Local planning authority should start from the premise that the permitted development rights automatically grants planning permission subject to prior approval requirements. From your recent correspondence, your main objections refer to: GPDO Class Q Q2(e) which states whether the location is undesirable or impractical.

Without doubt, this is subjective and will differ from person to person. However, paragraph 109 ref ID 13-109-20150305 of the Department for communities and Local Government Planning Practice guidelines states;

“The council should apply a reasonable, ordinary dictionary meaning. Impractical would mean ‘not be sensible or realistic’ and undesirable would mean ‘harmful or objectionable.’

We strongly believe that our application does not come under the terms ‘impractical’ or ‘undesirable’ and offer the following to support this further:

With reference to it not being realistic or sensible, this is immediately flawed due to the proximity of many residential and business dwellings, for example Northney lane and including 4 already existing properties on the same farm. The fact that permitted development means the change of use from agricultural use to a residential dwelling, means that the property is likely to be on a farm or similar setting. It seems that you are primarily concerned with the issue of potential future occupants. We are not planning to sell and cannot make that clear enough. If, god forbid, we found ourselves in a situation where we had to, people would buy if they wanted to and I am confident there would be an abundance of keen prospective buyers but please do not base your decision about who may or may not buy in the future, ultimately this would become our problem, not yours. We are the prospective occupants, nobody else and for us, this location is far from either undesirable or impractical. In fact, it is quite the opposite. This is a lifelong dream for us to be able to convert our own property and be able to continue to live and raise our family on the farm that has been in my family for generations. My parents grew up here, I grew up here, we currently live on the farm and raise our daughter here, as does my brother and his wife. This is a family farm, part of our heritage and something we feel very passionately about. This is certainly not a case of building a house to sell. I also work on the farm and own the tea rooms next door. It is vital that I remain close by for the benefit of the businesses.

Whilst it is encouraging to see that the environmental officer does not have an *‘objection in principle’*, we strongly feel that the argument regarding future occupants is defective as these considerations are not taken into account when new houses are built - as if this was the case, no one would build anywhere.

Many houses are built in less than desirable locations and are happily occupied – if conditions such as noise, potential hazards, smell and pollution were always taken into account, then there wouldn’t ever be houses under pylons, flight paths, near floodplains, next to motorways, near supermarkets, petrol stations, tips etc. People make choices on where they live based on what is important and favourable to them.

Country and farm living is incredibly desirable to some people. Similarly, prospective buyers would not choose to buy here if *‘potential flies, urine and faeces smell’* was a problem for them – it is

personal choice – the same as, we wouldn't choose to buy a property on a main road if we didn't like traffic noise or next to a school if we didn't like children. We already live on the farm and it is certainly not a problem for us – in fact, it is very much our way of life and has been for a very long time. The environmental officer claims that it may, at some point, be occupied by *“young family, caring for young infants, working nonstandard hours, with employment not connected with the farm etc”* – this is currently my wife's situation. This is not a case of potential future residents, this is actually our reality and one that she has chosen to marry into and one that we have chosen to continue because we want to, we embrace this lifestyle and one we want to raise our children in.

With regards to other areas of concern, on your site visit, the cow shed access was discussed and it was discussed that the North facing entrance already has a gate-this was open on your visit but is usually shut and can remain shut with the South facing access being used for tractor access so this need not be a concern. As for the hay barn, it was also agreed that a permanent solution can be made/ put in place to prevent any possibility of hay bales entering the rear garden.

We are willing to be flexible and compromise where possible which we have shown through our changes made to meet conservation needs (the conservation officer is now happy) and will always endeavour to do whatever possible to minimise any potential risk. Every practical measure possible will be taken to address your point regarding livestock proximity and farm vehicles etc however, as the farm currently stands, there are already 4 residential properties on the farm that could potentially be affected by the same issues and none of the current residents are adversely affected. In fact, full planning permission was given to my brother and his wife to convert the farm workshop which was, and still is, very much on the working farm with their parking and garden directly adjacent to the current farm entrance. The farm location being undesirable or impractical wasn't a concern then and hopefully, this letter goes some way to support that it shouldn't be a concern now. Extensive research shows that there are many other similar developments, many of which face far more challenges than ours, that have been passed across Hampshire and within other counties but on a local note, may I bring your attention to application APP/16/00338 – for The Dairy, Northwood Lane, Hayling Island –you have no idea who the future occupants will be, it is located on a direct farm site with moving agricultural vehicles and in close proximity to livestock – despite this, planning was granted.

Finally, if planning permission is not granted, then these buildings will be left to ruin which isn't in the best interest of anyone. Permitted development has been brought in to supposedly make it easier for people to convert agricultural buildings. All so that farmers can best cope with demands of modern farming and make profitable businesses, alongside the need to create desperately needed homes, reinvigorate rural communities and to help build a stronger, more sustainable countryside. You are always looking to build more homes on our Island but supporting local businesses and existing residents is equally as important - our farm has been a huge part of Hayling Island and the local community for generations and long may that continue.

Many thanks for your time in this matter and we hope we can work together to reach a mutually beneficial agreement.

Regards,

Mr. James Pike and Mrs. Victoria Pike.