
Site Address:	Northney Farm, St Peters Road, Hayling Island, PO11 0RX		
Proposal:	Change of use of agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (class C3) and for associated operational development subject to prior approval.		
Application No:	APP/18/00321	Expiry Date:	02/05/2018
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Pike		
Agent:	Mr P Hamblin	Case Officer:	David Eaves
	HJ Concepts Ltd		
Ward:	Hayling East		

Recommendation: Wrong Application type for recommendation code

1 Site Description

Northney Farm is a working farm located in Northney Village. The main farm building complex is sited to the east of St Peters Road comprising a mix of traditional and modern farm buildings. Along the St Peters Road frontage are two long standing dwellings and in more recent times a large traditional barn on the corner of St Peters Road and Northney Lane was converted to residential use following a Planning Permission.

The farm has also diversified with the opening of a tea room to the south of the main farm complex. An extension to the tea room has also recently been granted but not yet implemented.

The proposal itself relates to the conversion of a low cattle byre building and a stable building with a first floor hay loft. The buildings historic nature is recognised by their inclusion on the Councils list of Buildings of Local Interest due to their age, appearance, detailing and their association with traditional farming methods.

To the north of the buildings are residential properties fronting Northney Lane.

2 Planning History

00/58698/002 - New livestock building, PERM,20/09/2000

93/58698/000 - Application for prior approval for erection of Straw and Hay barn, PERM,12/09/1994

96/58698/001 - Application for approval of details of siting, design and appearance of proposed timber clad replacement agricultural barn., PARP,11/02/1998

93/58698/000 - Application for prior approval for erection of Straw and Hay barn, PERM,23/04/1994

04/58698/003 - Application to determine if prior approval is required for a new concrete access road (6m wide) with recessed gates., PARR,02/02/2004

05/58698/004 - Application to determine if prior approval is required for a new concrete access road (5m) (revised notice) and new recessed access with double gates to field for cows., PARP,22/03/2005

07/58698/005 - Re-surfacing of cow tracks with chalk rubble and adjacent storage yard with brick rubble topped gravel (part retrospective)., PERM,19/07/2007

APP/11/00071 - Non-Material Amendment of Planning Permission's 09/74191/000 & 09/74191/001 regarding the addition of 2No. windows to the east elevation of the tea room. , PERM,21/02/2011

APP/12/01071 - Erection of new agricultural building to provide winter housing for livestock., PERM,18/12/2012

APP/13/01262 - Extension of car park and associated landscaping., PERM,06/03/2014

APP/17/00983 - Change of use from agricultural building to 1No. dwellinghouse subject to prior approval., PAY,17/10/2017

Prior Approval Required and Refused on the 17th October 2017 for the following reasons:

1 The proposed development would introduce a residential use adjacent to a working farm, including livestock buildings, barns and tanks. The access to the building is also through a working farmyard. This would result in an unacceptable living environment for future residents by reason of noise, smell, fumes and activity all in close proximity to the building and its curtilage. The proposal is therefore considered to represent an impractical and undesirable change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order and would conflict with policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed development would result in alterations to traditional farm buildings which are considered to represent a heritage asset. The alterations proposed and in particular the number and positioning of new windows including rooflights are considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the buildings. Furthermore, the application does not include details of the structural condition of the buildings and the extent of likely repairs/rebuilding that would be required to convert the buildings. It is therefore not at this stage possible to conclude that the works could be carried out without substantial re-building works which would further detract from the character and heritage of the buildings. Taken together the proposal is considered to be harmful to the character of the buildings by reason of the design and external appearance proposed. The development therefore conflicts with policies CS11 and CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

APP/17/01071 - Single storey rear extension to Tea Rooms., PERM,26/02/2018

3 Proposal

Change of use of agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (class C3) and for associated operational development subject to prior approval.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS9	(Housing)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM13	(Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM24	(Recreational Disturbance to Special Protected Areas (SPAs) from Residential Development)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Conservation Officer, Development Control

Site

The buildings in question are locally listed. This Due to their age, appearance, detailing and their association with traditional farming methods.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications along with the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

Paragraph 135 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Paragraph 64 (Section 7 Requiring Good Design) is also particularly relevant to this case in that development should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Assessment

Traditional agriculture/stable buildings are a significant part of our heritage and one of the objectives for allowing conversions is to enable these buildings to be retained for future generations. It is therefore essential that the characteristics of the buildings survive to be identifiable in the future.

The design of a conversion must commence with the existing building and not with a preconceived notion regarding the size or type of accommodation required, or the most profitable scheme. Applicants may have to accept that the building imposes constraints that will require compromise to retain its character. The opportunities and limitations presented by the buildings will determine the form of accommodation possible and an approach exploiting these features will be the only way to reach an acceptable design solution that conforms to the planning policy. In essence the finished building and its surroundings should complement its original use.

The buildings are a key element of the character of this site, providing a significant feature within the original arrangement of agricultural buildings.

The works proposed include a variety of amendments to the originally refused scheme APP/17/00983. Whilst as part of the scheme many external alterations are proposed these are now in keeping with the agricultural character of the buildings. New openings have been limited and existing openings have been well utilised. Existing openings are a fundamental element of the buildings character and allow the original form and function to be understood. I am therefore encouraged to see this has been implemented.

In broad terms I consider the intended changes to the layout and use of the building can be accommodated. Changing from storage to ancillary residential use inevitably involves a degree of compromise in order to suitably upgrade for habitable accommodation.

The scheme has therefore been appropriately designed as it allows for the historic agricultural character of the building to be substantially maintained and would allow for a future use of these buildings.

Engineering/Drainage

No comments received

Environmental Health:

I have perused the enclosed plans / documentation provided by the applicant. I have also been to site and noted the layout of the existing farmyard in this area in relation to the building under proposal.

Whilst I have no objection in principle to the conversion of the existing structures to a dwelling unit, I am not convinced that under the existing circumstances that this would be in the best interests of any future residents of said dwelling, if permitted.

I therefore comment as follows:

- a. that one of the tractor access / exit points for feed, hay, bedding removal etc from the cow shed, is onto the proposed 'closed off' area, thus leaving this area to remain a part of the working farmyard.
- b. with the very close proximity of the proposed building conversion to Class C3 dwelling, to the existing farmyard and cow shed, I have reservations with regard to the potential nuisance aspect that could affect future residents of said dwelling. These

nuisances would include animal and machinery noise, odour from animal faeces and urine, and the potential to be affected from time to time by insects such as flies.

Environmental Control Officer:

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the revised documentation submitted in support of this new application, following the refusal of the 2017 application.

I note that the scheme is broadly similar to that previously put forward, and is essentially unchanged as regards matters relevant to pollution, contamination and air quality. In this respect, comments made under the 2017 application (APP/17/00983, ref: CONS/17/01846, 04/10/2017) are considered to remain valid. For convenience, I will reproduce comments and recommended conditions below.

Contamination

Essentially, the logic presented for refuting need to address contamination is flawed. It is not relevant that the land is not known to be contaminated - this is supposition, not supported by empirical data. By virtue of its agricultural association there is increased risk of contaminants being present at the site, and the proposed landuse (general C3) is contamination sensitive - with dwellings with private garden areas being the most contamination sensitive residential use type. It should be noted that small averaging areas (i.e. single gardens) are more likely to meet the statutory definition of Contaminated Land (Part 2A of the EPA 1990), as the definition is related to a statistical assessment of the likely true population mean over a relevant averaging area - a source within a small relevant area is likely to have a higher mean/area than the same source within an area of increased size.

National Planning Policy (and 10 c) i) of schedule 2, Pt. 3, W (to the GPDO 2015)) require that as a minimum standard, developed land must not be capable of being determined to be contaminated land under Part 2A of the EPA 1990. It follows that there must be sufficient evidence to decide this (or sufficient provision to determine this, and ensure that the site cannot be determined to be contaminated land prior to occupation) in order for a positive determination of a PN application to be made. It is essential therefore for empirical data to be collected, both from within existing building footprints, and within the proposed garden areas. It is not anticipated that adverse results will prejudice deliverability of a residential scheme, so I would be comfortable with this being dealt with by way of conditional approval.

"Unacceptable" Living Environment

I would also like to make a general comment as regards the submission addressing 'Reason 1', in respect of Q2 1. e) (related to the previous reason for refusal), and more generally in respect of the application of policy.

I note that the applicant refers to having "no intention of splitting the site from the Northney Farm", and claims that as a result, the development would not be in conflict with policy CS16 or DM10. I also note that the submission implies that the applicant intends to reside within the proposed dwelling, and that the LPA should take account of their connection / familiarity with farm operations (and their impacts) in the application (or otherwise) of local and national policy.

I would challenge these assertions on the basis that;

i) the change in use class from agricultural building to C3 dwellinghouse is by definition separating the site from Northney Farm (as an operational agricultural concern), and;

ii) the initial occupant is irrelevant to the application - the permitted development is a change of use to C3 dwellinghouse, and unless otherwise controlled by restrictive conditional approval (of which the reasonableness would be in doubt), this use class is non-specific as to either the type- or tolerances- of occupants. It must be assumed that at some point during the anticipated lifetime of the use class allocation, the dwelling could be occupied by pollutant / contaminant / nuisance sensitive persons - e.g. a family caring for young infants, producing home grown vegetables, working non-standard hours, working from home or with employment not connected with the farm (etc.)

It is considered that 'desirable' is a key conditional phrase, and I would interpret the proper definition of this in terms of compliance with local & national policy - a scheme which complies with local & national policy should be regarded as 'desirable', and one which is contrary should be regarded as 'undesirable' (and therefore conclude that it should not be permitted). In this way, I see no reason for the PN status of this application to excuse it from the need to comply with policy DM10, or any other policy relating to the desirability of a C3 use.

I am aware that there has been some input from my colleague, Mark Moss as regards odour, noise, and other public health issues - so there is no need for me to comment in more detail. I thought it useful however to set out the basis by which it is expected that a PN application would meet the same 'principle of development' standards as a standard application in areas listed in Q.2, where the provisions of 1. e) are notably broad.

Previous Comments, and suggested conditions:

The text below is reproduced from the October 2017 consultation response referenced above. The application is considered to be insufficient to demonstrate that the scheme is not contrary to local & national policy, if granted without being subject to conditions 1 & 2 listed below.

☐ The land and buildings in question are agricultural (a potentially contaminating land use, where contamination is typically associated with the central 'yard' complex, vehicle & equipment storage areas, and with made ground located beneath hardstanding).

☐ The buildings may not form part of the active farm, but were present <1867, and would have formed part of the active farm at some point during their history.

☐ Some demolition and construction works are associated with the Eastern end of the building, dating to approximately the mid 1960's.

☐ Vehicle garaging and storage areas with large openings (more likely to be associated with mechanical equipment storage)

☐ The proposed landuse is sensitive, comprising residential accommodation predominantly on ground floor, with private garden areas, and within buildings with elevated pathway risk resulting from their construction type (e.g. solid wall, ground bearing floor slab)

Contaminants typically associated with Farm use are materials linked with livestock parasite & pest control (e.g. Arsenic, Copper), hydrocarbons (lube oils, solid & liquid fuels, combustion residues), construction related contaminants (Lead, Asbestos), and various metallic compounds associated with imported fill (e.g. hardcore - especially where combustion process derived) and local waste disposal.

The proposed development could in principle meet the description of contaminated land as a result of the proposed development. Insufficient information is presently available to dismiss this risk.

For the reasons summarised above, it is considered that prior approval is required for this development, and if granted, should be subject to suitable conditions to ensure that the land is either confirmed to be suitable for use in C3 class, or will be made suitable through a scheme of appropriate remediation or risk mitigation. Suggested wording overleaf:

Contamination (Standard – omitting EDS) [1]

Prior to the commencement of development hereby approved (other than any site clearance partial demolition and consequential works for the purpose of ensuring structural stability), an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination at the site, whether originating from within or outside the curtilage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment shall be undertaken by competent persons, and the findings presented as a written report.

The assessment may comprise separate reports as appropriate, but unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include;

1) Site investigation appropriate to both the previous & approved use of the site, to provide sufficient data and information to adequately identify & characterise any physical contamination on or affecting the site, and to inform an appropriate assessment of the risks to future occupants.

2) The results of an appropriate risk assessment based upon (1), and where unacceptable risks are identified, a Remediation Strategy that includes;

- ☐ appropriately considered remedial objectives,
- ☐ an appraisal of remedial &/or risk mitigation options, having due regard to sustainability, and;
- ☐ clearly defined proposals for mitigation of the identified risks.

3) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the Remediation Strategy (2) are complete, to include consideration of contingency action.

All elements shall be adhered to unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: Having due regard to policies DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy [2011] and DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], Contamination may be present at the site as a result of both previous & current land uses (&/or activities) that could pose a risk to future site occupiers.

Verification (Standard) [2]

Prior to the occupation of any relevant part of the permitted development, any verification report

required in accordance with condition [1] shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan, and must demonstrate that site remediation criteria have been met.

Where longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages is identified as being necessary, the report shall clearly set out plans for monitoring, provision for maintenance, relevant triggers and contingency actions (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan").

The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.
Reason: Having due regard to policies DM10 of the Havant Borough Adopted Core Strategy

[2011] and DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014],

Contamination may be

present at the site as a result of both previous & current land uses (&/or activities) that could pose a risk to future site occupiers.

Highways Engineer, Development Engineer

The Highway Authority have no adverse comment to this application.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 14

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
We do not object to the development of the barn into a dwelling, although we note that planning permission was refused previously on the grounds that its location was unsuitable for residential development and we do not see how this has changed.	Comments noted and assessed under part 7
However we do object to the proposal to extend the garden of the new property immediately to the rear of our garden. We do not think this is necessary as the plans for the proposed development demonstrate	If prior approval were recommended conditions in relation to garden areas and boundary treatments could have been considered.

that the barn has adequate land to the south to provide a garden for the new property, which would be considerably less intrusive for adjoining properties. We object to the proposal on the following grounds:	
1. Fire safety - throughout the 30 years we have owned this property, this narrow strip of land between the rear gardens of 9-12 Northney Lane and the large hay barn in Northney Farm has always been designated as a fire break to reduce the risk of a fire in the hay barn spreading to neighbouring properties. If the land is allowed to be developed, what steps will be taken to prevent the risk of fire spreading from the hay barn to neighbouring properties? In the winter months, the barn is full of large hay/straw bales and we therefore see this as a critical concern for the health and safety of local residents.	The area is shown as a garden and it is considered that there is unlikely to be a change in fire risk
2. Loss of privacy - the garden of the new property will adjoin our boundary and overlook our rear garden, resulting in a significant loss of privacy for us, with potential for noise nuisance. We would prefer that the developer is not allowed to extend the garden to the rear of our property, but if he is given permission, we would like this to be subject to a minimum of 2 metre high boundary fence being erected and maintained by the developer.	If prior approval were recommended conditions in relation to boundary treatments could have been considered.
3. General environment - the landowners have failed to maintain the land to the rear of 9-12 Northney Lane and over the years have allowed it to become very overgrown with large trees and undergrowth. This has reduced light to the neighbouring properties and encouraged rats, which have been seen in our gardens on a number of occasions. As part of the development proposals, we would ask that the landowner is required to clear and tidy this land and then keep it tidy in perpetuity. This will also help maintain it as a fire break.	Comments noted, however the use of the building for residential purposes and the rear garden would if granted prior approval be likely to reduce these concerns.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 This application is a prior notification under Schedule 2 Part 3 Class Q of the GPDO 2015.

Q. Development consisting of—
(a) a change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage from a use as an agricultural building to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order; and
(b) building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building referred to in paragraph (a) to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of that Schedule.

The GPDO sets a series of tests under Q.1 stating that 'Development is not permitted by class Q ' unless a number of tests are met. The applicant has confirmed that the development would meet tests (a) - (m).

7.2 A number of conditions then need to be met:

Q.2—(1) Where the development proposed is development under Class Q(a) together with development under Class Q(b), development is permitted subject to the condition that before beginning the development, the developer must apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to—

(a) transport and highways impacts of the development,
(b) noise impacts of the development,
(c) contamination risks on the site,
(d) flooding risks on the site,
(e) whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, and
(f) the design or external appearance of the building,

and the provisions of paragraph W (prior approval) of this Part apply in relation to that application.

7.3 (a) transport and highways impacts of the development,

The site is accessed via an existing access which also serves the farm and the existing barn conversion. There are also other access points into the farm complex. Access for cars would be across the farm yard. the application proposes making the other accesses to the farm complex The main access to the complex and restricting the access to the residential unit for existing and proposed residential uses and office buildings. There is an existing gate with its location shown on the aerial photograph which is intended to limit farm related access to the area in front of the proposed

conversion. It was noted at the officers site visit that access is taken by tractors through the existing cattle building to the south of the conversion with tractors exiting that building opposite the proposed conversion. It was also noted that the plans indicate that the hay barn would also allow for access through that building to the front of the converted building. The practicality of conditioning restrictions to routes for farm vehicles and machinery has been considered. It would appear that such restrictions would not meet current requirements in relation to the cattle building and the closing/opening of a gate could not reasonably be conditioned or monitored by the Local Planning Authority.

The practical operation of farming requirements is considered to continue to raise concerns in relation to the proposed residential use and is considered further in relation to (e) considered further below.

Strictly in terms of the transport and highways impacts of the development however the access to the highway is considered acceptable and car parking to meet the Councils car parking standards for a 4 bed dwelling could be provided with the adaption of the existing large agricultural storage building.

7.4 (b) noise impacts of the development.

The proposed development is located adjacent to the residential curtilage of properties fronting Northney Lane. In general terms it is considered that a residential use is likely to be less noisy than the potential agricultural uses that could take place within the building (for example at the time of the case officers visit the byre was housing calf's).

7.5 (c) contamination risks on the site.

Given the sites use as a working farm the Councils Environmental Control Officer has identified potential concerns in relation to the development. It is considered that prior approval is required for the proposed development in relation to the potential contamination risks to the occupiers of the buildings to be converted and their proposed curtilage. If Prior Approval had been recommended for approval conditions would have been imposed to ensure that the land is either confirmed to be suitable for use in C3 class, or will be made suitable through a scheme of appropriate remediation or risk mitigation.

7.6 (d) flooding risks on the site.

The site lies within Flood Zone 1 an area of low flood risk. The Councils Engineer raised no objection to the proposed development in relation to the previous application APP/17/00983 and had Prior Approval been permitted conditions in relation to foul and surface water drainage would have been proposed.

7.7 (e) whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order

Planning Practice Guidance 'Permitted development rights for the change of use of agricultural buildings' provided guidance on this matter.

When considering whether it is appropriate for the change of use to take place in a particular location, a local planning authority should start from the premise that the

permitted development right grants planning permission, subject to the prior approval requirements. That an agricultural building is in a location where the local planning authority would not normally grant planning permission for a new dwelling is not a sufficient reason for refusing prior approval.

There may, however, be circumstances where the impact cannot be mitigated. Therefore, when looking at location, local planning authorities may, for example, consider that because an agricultural building on the top of a hill with no road access, power source or other services its conversion is impractical. Additionally the location of the building whose use would change may be undesirable if it is adjacent to other uses such as intensive poultry farming buildings, silage storage or buildings with dangerous machines or chemicals.

When a local authority considers location and siting it should not therefore be applying tests from the National Planning Policy Framework except to the extent these are relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval. So, for example, factors such as whether the property is for a rural worker, or whether the design is of exceptional quality or innovative, are unlikely to be relevant.

The proposed conversion is to buildings situated within an active working farm complex. Whilst some measures have been suggested with regard to access routes, there remains clear potential for agricultural vehicles and equipment to use the area to the north of the cattle barn where access is required through the building. As mentioned above it is considered difficult to impose conditions in relation to access routes and gates that potentially negatively impact the farming requirements of the operation and are not readily monitorable by the Local Planning Authority. The building would be sited in very close proximity to farming activity including the keeping of livestock (cattle) within 13m-22m from the converted building. It was understood at the site visit that the calves currently housed in a lower section of the main cattle building are likely to be re-located, however, if this is to a new building it may be that this would require its own consent. In any case, the main cattle building would remain and this is partly open and facing the proposed building conversion.

The converted building would also be sited adjacent to a large barn used for arable storage and a tall tank (which is understood to currently not be in use but could be used in the future).

The converted building would be fronting onto this active farm area and would include an external curtilage partly fronting onto the farmyard. It is considered that the farming activity, including a level of farm vehicle movements, livestock and farm storage would lead to a residential use within the buildings being undesirable and impractical. The farming activity would dominate the residential property leading to noise, smell, fume and disturbance from farming activity. This would result in harmful impacts both to the resident of the building and to the working operations of the farm.

Whilst it is noted that the applicant is seeking to occupy the building and has a link to the farm, a personal condition is not considered appropriate in relation to a permanent development of this nature and an agricultural tie is not considered appropriate for an application for a Class C dwellinghouse under prior approval.

7.8 (f) the design or external appearance of the building.

The buildings are considered to represent a non designated heritage asset due to their age, appearance, detailing and their association with traditional farming methods. The proposed works to the buildings have been considered by the Councils Conservation

Officer who has raised no objection to the proposed conversion.

The proposal is accompanied by a structural report and from the evidence available it is considered that the buildings could be successfully converted without substantial re-building.

8 Conclusion

In conclusion the proposed development is considered to require Prior Approval. In assessing the proposals it is considered that the development should be refused prior approval as the development would be impractical or undesirable as a residential use adjacent to the farm use and activities.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to Wrong Application type for recommendation code for application APP/18/00321

(A) for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed development would introduce a residential use adjacent to a working farm, including livestock buildings, barns and tanks. The residential use would also be likely to be impacted by farm vehicle and equipment movement and operation. This would result in an unacceptable living environment for future residents by reason of noise, smell, fumes, and activity all in close proximity to the building and its curtilage. The proposal is therefore considered to represent an impractical and undesirable change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order and would conflict with policies CS16 and DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan and the National Planning policy Framework.