

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

DM20 (Historic Assets)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

FAO Conservation Officer, Development Control

No objection.

The barn that is subject of this application is not listed but is located within a farm yard opposite a Grade II listed barn. The barn is not to be extended as part of the proposals but significant alterations are to be made to the elevations so that the conversion to offices can be achieved. As the barn is not to be extended there is going to be little in the way of impact on the setting of listed building that already exists. Car parking will be required within the farm yard but again I do not believe this will impact on the significance of the nearby listed barn and as such is considered acceptable.

Under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, decision makers are required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. In exercising this duty in this case for the reasons set out above I consider the proposal would preserve the nearby listed buildings setting and the features of historic interest associated with that setting.

County Archaeologist

Although the site is located close to the former Hayling Priory, in an Area of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP), the fact that the application appears to involve very little ground disturbance and would be very unlikely to expose interpretable archaeological features means that I would not wish to raise any archaeological issues in this instance.

FAO Mr P Marshall, Development Engineer

No adverse comments.

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

I have reviewed the environmental context of this application site. I note that the existing site has been in use for agricultural purposes since the earliest available mapping (1879). The modern site is associated with various tanks / silos etc., and historically the site has been associated with excavations that are likely to now represent made ground (e.g. saw pits), historically being not atypical for such features to be utilised for disposal of waste when they were no longer required.

Farm complexes are generally associated with contamination of various types that are associated with the operation of machinery, and the storage and handling of potentially contaminating products, including pesticides / herbicides, fuels, soil conditioners, waste materials, timber treatments etc.. In this way, the site is regarded as being likely to have elevated contaminants within soils around the wider complex, probably limited to relatively localised areas close to where the source material was handled, or (potentially contaminating) activity undertaken.

I note that the flexible use includes only commercial uses, with no proposed use class being regarded as having particular sensitivity to contamination (i.e. over and above the existing commercial land use). Even A3 & C1 uses have a risk profile characterised by low public / customer exposure, and therefore risk would likely be judged on a commercial use basis (i.e. risk to employees) unless foodstuffs were

produced locally on site (close to the farm complex) for public consumption. This is essentially an equivalent risk profile to that for the existing use.

It would appear that no groundworks / major redevelopment is proposed which might expose or mobilise contamination, or otherwise alter the risk status of the land & buildings. Similarly, there is no reason to expect that gross contamination by acutely hazardous substances is likely - obviously in the absence of empirical data this cannot be entirely ruled out, but a risk judgement as to the likelihood of such contamination being is considered to be both reasonable & defensible.

It is worth noting that Environmental Health would seek confirmation of soil conditions in the event of a change in the risk status of the site (i.e. introduction of contamination sensitive receptors / occupants etc.), or any comprehensive redevelopment (comprising groundworks likely to disturb or mobilise contamination / a form of development likely to prevent future access to a contamination source which could reasonably be expected to be present). If unacceptable risks are identified, remediation or risk mitigation would also be required in connection with that future redevelopment / change of use.

Within the context of this application however, and on the basis of the above; I do not consider it reasonable to require a site investigation as a condition of the proposed change of landuse status; or indeed to recommend refusal of this application (i.e. require formal planning consent) on grounds of contamination risk. I therefore offer no adverse comment.

Mr Ganesh Selvarajah, Business Development/External Funding Officer

No concerns over the change of use and can be supported from an economic growth perspective.

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: 3

Number of site notices: 1.

Statutory advertisement: 23/12/2016

Number of representations received:

One letter was received from one address raising the following point:

- 6.1 No objection to the proposed change of use, but concerns with respect to the increase in the number and speed of vehicles using the private access road - the use and of the private access road is a civil matter which would need to be resolved between the applicant and his neighbour.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Impact upon the streetscene and character of the area
- (iii) Impact upon residential amenity

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is situated outside the built up area, and the Council's normal approach to the provision of additional office floorspace is to seek to concentrate it within the urban areas and town centre locations in particular (policies CS2 and CS17 refer). As such it is important that consideration is given as to whether, notwithstanding these local plan policies, the development complies with national policies for the countryside. In this case the NPPF states a positive approach to viable new development in rural areas. It supports the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas and promotes the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. This application would provide a small business the opportunity to start-up or remain on Hayling Island, as such being sustainable and providing the opportunity to employ a small number of local people. It is noted that the Economic Development team has not objected to the proposal, and the form of change of use proposed is now encompassed in permitted development rights. Taken together it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in principle.

(ii) Impact upon the streetscene and character of the area

7.3 It is considered that there will not be any adverse impact due to the location of this building within the site, and the associated alterations will upgrade the exterior. As such it is considered that the proposal will accord with policy CS16 of the Core Strategy.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity and highways

7.4 It is considered that there will not be any impact due to the location of this building within the site and the operations already undertaken at the farm. Ample parking provision is provided within the site. It is therefore considered that the proposal will accord with policies CS16 and DM14 of the Core Strategy.

8 Conclusion

8.1 It is considered that this proposal for the change of use of a small building within the site would not conflict with relevant local or national policies and therefore it is recommended permission is granted subject to the conditions listed below.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application APP/16/01243 subject to the following conditions

- 1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The external materials used shall match, in type, colour and texture, those of the existing building so far as practicable.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the area and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 The car parking, servicing and other vehicular access arrangements shown on the approved plans to serve the development hereby permitted shall be made fully available for use prior to the development being first brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for their intended purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and having due regard to policy DM13 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location plan

Block plan

Proposed elevations plan (i)

Proposed elevations plan (ii)

Proposed parking plan

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.