



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 6 - 9 November 2018

Site visit made on 9 November 2018

by Kenneth Stone BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/W/18/3199119

Land east of Posbrook Lane, Titchfield, Fareham, Hampshire PO14 4EZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Foreman Homes Ltd against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/17/0681/OA, dated 9 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as an 'Outline Planning Application for Scout Hut, up to 150 Dwellings, Community Garden, associated landscaping, amenity areas and means of access from Posbrook Lane in addition to the provision of 58,000 square metres of community green space'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration with the exception of access. The access details are shown on the plan 'Proposed Site Access 16-314/003E' which along with the 'Site Location Plan 16.092.01E' are the plans that describe the proposals. An illustrative plan was submitted and the latest iteration was 16.092.02F. However, this was for illustrative purposes only to demonstrate one way in which the site could be developed but does not form part of the formal details of the application.
3. Prior to the commencement of the Inquiry the Council and the appellant entered into a Statement of Common Ground. The original application had been submitted with the description of development in the banner heading above. The parties agreed that there was no requirement for the Scout Hut and removed this from the illustrative master plan and amended the description of development to reflect the amended proposed development.
4. I am satisfied that the proposed alteration to the scheme, which does not amend the red line boundary and makes only a minor adjustment to the overall scheme, is not material. I am satisfied that there would be no material prejudice to parties who would have wished to comment on the proposals and that the amended illustrative plan was available as part of the appeal documents and therefore available for parties to view and comment on. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the amended description which

read as follows: 'Outline application for up to 150 dwellings, community garden, associated landscaping, amenity areas and a means of access from Posbrook Lane.'

5. In the Statement of Common Ground the Council and the Appellant agree that an Appropriate Assessment would be required in the light of The People Over Wind Judgement¹. During the Inquiry a shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment document was submitted (APP4) to enable an Appropriate Assessment to be made. In this regard I consulted with Natural England to ensure that I had the relevant information before me if such an assessment were to be required. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on Natural England's consultation response.
6. By way of an e-mailed letter dated 5 November 2018 the Secretary of State notified the appellant, pursuant to regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, that further information was required. The further information was publicised on 4 January 2019, a period of 31 days was given for the receipt of comments and the parties were given a period following the end of the publicity period to collate and comment on the matters raised.
7. I have had regard to all the Environmental Information submitted with the appeal including the original Environmental Statement, the Additional Information, the Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment, the further responses and the parties' comments in reaching my conclusions on this appeal.
8. The Council has drawn my attention to a recent appeal decision, at Old Street, APP/A1720/W/18/3200409, which had been published since the Inquiry was conducted and in which similar issues were considered in respect of the Meon Valley. The parties were given the opportunity to comment on this decision.
9. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and updated guidance on how to assess housing needs as well as results of the Housing Delivery Test along with a technical note on 19 February 2019. The parties were given the opportunity to comment on how these may affect their respective cases. I have had regard to this information and the comments of the parties in reaching my decision.
10. I closed the Inquiry in writing on 19 March 2019.

Main Issues

11. In the Statement of Common Ground the appellant and Council agree that with the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement reasons for refusal e through to l would be addressed. No objections to the Unilateral Undertaking were raised by the Council and these matters were not contested at the Inquiry. It was also agreed in the Statement of Common Ground that reason for refusal d could be overcome by the imposition of an appropriately worded condition, and I see no reason why this would not be appropriate.
12. On the basis of the above the remaining outstanding matters and the main issues in this appeal are:

¹ The Court of Justice of the European Union judgement in the People over Wind and Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta, case C-323/17

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including having regard to whether or not the site is a valued landscape and the effect on the strategic gap;
- The effect of the proposed development on the setting of 'Great Posbrook' and the 'Southern barn at Great Posbrook Farm' Grade II* listed buildings; and
- The effect of the proposed development on Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land (BMVAL).

Reasons

13. The development plan for the area includes The Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2011 -2026) (LPP1), The Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites & Policies (2015) (LPP2) and The Local Plan Part 3: Welbourne Plan (2015) (LPP3).
14. LPP3 specifically addresses a new settlement at Welbourne and does not include policies that bear directly on the effects of the development the subject of this appeal. Its relevance is however material in the context of the wider housing land supply issues in the area.
15. In terms of LPP1 policy CS14 seeks to control development outside defined settlement boundaries seeking to resist proposals which would adversely affect its landscape character and function. While policy CS22 advises land within strategic gaps will be treated as countryside and development proposals will not be permitted where it affects the integrity of the gap and the physical and visual separation of settlements.
16. In LPP2 Policy DSP6 further advises in respect of residential development outside of defined urban settlement boundaries that it should avoid a detrimental impact on the character or landscape of the surrounding area. DSP5 addresses the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. In considering the impacts of proposals that affect designated heritage assets it advises the Council will give great weight to their conservation and that any harm or loss will require clear and convincing justification, reflecting the statutory and national policy positions.
17. Policy DSP40 in LPP2 includes a contingency position where the Council does not have a 5 year supply of housing land. It is common ground between the parties that the Council does not have a 5 year supply of land for housing albeit the extent, length of time this may persist and consequences are disputed. I address these latter matters further below however insofar as the parties agree that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land the contingency position in policy DSP40 is engaged and this advises that additional sites outside the urban area boundary may be permitted where certain criteria are met.
18. An emerging draft Local Plan, which in due course is anticipated to replace LPP1 and LPP2, was launched for consultation in autumn of 2017 but has now been withdrawn. At the time of the Inquiry I was informed that a further review is to take place following revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Government's latest consultation in respect of housing figures. The Council propose to consult on issues and options relevant to the progression of the Council's new development strategy following the outcome

of the Government's recent consultation. Consultation on a new draft Local Plan is not now anticipated until the end of 2019.

19. The Titchfield Neighbourhood Plan 2011 – 2036 (TNP) is also emerging; it was published for consultation in July 2018 with a further draft submitted to the Council for a compliance check, in October 2018, prior to consultation as the submission draft. At the Inquiry it was confirmed that further documents were submitted to the Council and that the TNP complied with the Statutory requirements. The Council undertook Consultation on the submission draft between November 2018 and January 2019 but at this point in time the plan has not yet been submitted for independent examination. The TNP includes a plan identifying the strategic gap, the Meon gap, and the Defined Urban Settlement Boundary (DUSB) as well as housing policies which review the DUSB (DUSB 1) and address windfall sites (H1), affordable housing (H2), Local Need (H3) and Development Design (H4).

Character and Appearance, including Valued Landscape and Strategic Gap

20. The appeal site is an area of some 6.6 ha of open grazing field on the east side of Posbrook Lane. The land gently slopes from its north-west corner towards its eastern edge. The site is segregated from Posbrook Lane by a hedgerow but for the most part the site is open with little demarking fences, trees or hedge rows. There is some evidence of a previous subdivision of the site on a modern fence line however only limited post foundations remain and generally the whole site has a reasonably consistent grazed grassland appearance.
21. To the north, the appeal site abuts the settlement edge of Titchfield at an estate called Bellfield. The urban edge is open and harsh with little by way of softening landscaping. Towards the south-western corner the site abuts a cluster of buildings that includes the farmstead of Posbrook farm and which includes two Grade II* listed buildings (the Farmhouse and the southern barn). The boundary between these is screened for the most part by a substantial tree and hedgerow belt. Beyond these and towards the south are open agricultural fields. To the east the site slopes down to the Titchfield Canal, valley floor and River Meon beyond.
22. The Meon Valley is a major landscape feature that runs through the Borough and slices through the coastal plain. The parties agree that the site is located within the Lower Meon Valley Character Area but disagree as to the finer grain character type as detailed in the 1996 and 2017 Fareham Landscape Assessments. The appellant points to the 2017 Assessment identifying the western part of the appeal site as being identified as open coastal plain: Fringe Character with a small portion of the site being open valley side. The Council contend that the whole site is more appropriately identified as open valley side.
23. The difference in opinion and identification relates to the influence of the urban settlement boundary, the topography of the site and other landscape features in the surroundings. The fact that the 2017 classification is based on somewhat historic data does call into question the accuracy at the finer grain. There is some evidence in terms of photographs and on site that the site was subdivided and that there may have been different practices implemented which resulted in parts of the site having a different appearance and therefore leading to a different classification at that stage. On site I was firmly of the view that the site was of an open character with little in the way of field boundaries, hedges or other landscape features to different areas of the site.

Whilst there was a break in the slope this was minimal and did not change the characterisation from a gentle slope. There were minor variations across the site and I was not persuaded that this was such a feature that would change the character type of the site. Finally, in the context of the urban settlement edge influence it is undeniable that it is there. There is a lack of screening and there is a harsh and readily visible urban edge. This however is a distinct break with the open rural field which then flows to the open agricultural fields beyond the farmstead cluster and the lower valley floor below. In my view in the wider context the urban influence is given too much weight in the appellant's assessment and in association with the sub division of the site into smaller fields adds to the reduced weight given to the effect of the proposed development.

24. The proposed development would result in the provision of a suburban housing estate of up to 150 units on an open field that would substantively change the character of the field. The field appears, when looking south and east, as part of the broader landscape compartment and part of the Lower Meon Valley landscape. Views back towards the site would result in the perception of the intrusion of housing further into the valley and valley sides to the detriment of the character of the valley. The characteristics of the site are consistent with those of the Meon Valley and representative of the open valley side which includes sloping landform, a lack of woodland with views across the valley floor and is generally pastoral with some intrusive influences of roads or built development.
25. The visual effects of the development would be evident from a number of public footpaths both through and surrounding the appeal site as well as along Posbrook Lane, to the south and from the valley floor and opposite valley side. The further encroachment of built development into the countryside would detract from the rural appearance of the area.
26. The potential for landscaping to screen and reduce the visual effects and to a certain extent provide some positive contribution was advanced by the appellant. Whilst additional landscaping along the proposed urban edge would produce an edge that was more screened and in effect a softer edge than present is undeniable and would of itself improve the appearance of the existing urban edge. However, this needs to be weighed against the loss of the open field separation of elements of built development and the creeping urbanisation of the area. Whilst planting would assist in reducing the direct line of sight of houses in the longer term there would still be effects from noise, activity, illumination in the evening along with the localised views that would inevitably and substantively change.
27. I would characterise the landscape and visual effects as substantial and harmful in the short to medium term, albeit this would reduce in the longer term, I would still view the adverse effect as significant.
28. There is some dispute as to whether the site is a valued landscape. The Lower Meon Valley is a significant landscape feature and both parties assessed the site against the box 5.1 criteria in Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. In this context it is a reasonable conclusion that both parties accept that the Lower Meon Valley has attributes that are above the ordinary. There is some debate as to whether the appeal site contributes to these or is part of that as a valued landscape. On the basis of the evidence before me I

have no difficulty in accepting that the Lower Meon Valley is a valued landscape in the context of the Framework and this is a conclusion consistent with my colleague in the Old Road decision. From my visit to the site and the evidence presented to me I am of the view that the appeal site shares a number of those attributes including the nature of the rural landscape and topography, its scenic quality and that it is representative of the valley sides character type. The site does form part of the broad visual envelope of the Lower Meon valley and part of the landscape compartment and therefore should be considered as part of the valued landscape.

29. Turning to the issue of the strategic gap. The appeal site is located in the Meon Valley strategic gap. The purpose of the strategic gap as identified in policy CS22 is to prevent development that significantly affects the integrity of the gap and the physical and visual separation of settlements. Whilst the Council sought to broaden this out to include the setting of settlements that is not how the development plan policy or indeed its policy justification is written. This states the gaps help to define and maintain the separate identity of individual settlements and are important in maintaining the settlement pattern, keeping individual settlements separate and providing opportunities for green corridors. To go beyond these factors in assessing the development against policy would be introducing tests that are not within the development plan.
30. The proposed scheme would extend the urban edge of Titchfield further into the gap than it presently is. There would however be no perception of coalescence or indeed any visual reduction of the separate settlements (I do not see the cluster of buildings as a separate settlement in this context). There would be no demonstrable reduction in the physical separation and the gap's integrity would not be significantly affected. Whilst there would be a minor outward extension in the context of the settlement pattern and separation of settlements the proposed development would be minor and would not result in a significant effect.
31. Overall for the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would result in harm to a valued landscape. There would however be no significant effect on the strategic Meon Gap. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with policies CS14 and DSP6 which seek to protect the character and appearance of the area of land outside the defined urban settlement boundary but would not conflict with policy CS22.

Setting of 'Great Posbrook' and the 'Southern barn at Great Posbrook Farm' Grade II listed buildings*

32. South of Titchfield on the east side of Posbrook Lane there is an historic farmstead that includes the listed buildings of Great Posbrook and the southern barn at great Posbrook farm. Both of these are Grade II* which puts them in the top 8% or so of listed buildings in the Country. They are a significant and invaluable resource.
33. The list description for Great Posbrook identifies it as a C16 house altered in the C19 with evidence of elements of C17 and C18 interior details. There is some question mark over the precise dating of the origins of the building with the Council pointing to evidence that it dates from early C17. While the alterations have created two parallel ranges the earlier T shaped form is unusual and is of particular architectural importance because of its rarity. The

main parties' experts agree that the building is of considerable historic interest due to its fabric, architectural composition and features.

34. The list description for the southern barn identifies it as a late medieval aisled barn. However, the Council point to more recent dendrochronology which indicates that it is likely to be late C16 or early C17 with the eastern end being C18. It is a substantial historic barn with considerable vernacular architectural interest being a good and relatively rare example of a high status English barn. Its size and scale demonstrating its association with a high status farm.
35. The listings make reference to other buildings in the cluster forming the farmstead including a store shed, small barn, cartshed and pigsties but note that these are of local interest only. The main listed buildings together with the buildings of local interest form an early farmstead with a manorial farmhouse, significant barn and numerous other buildings. There have been recent interventions as part of enabling development which resulted in the demolition of modern farm buildings the conversion of some of the historic buildings and the construction of new buildings to provide for additional residential occupation on the site. Much of the new building footprint was related to original buildings in an attempt to reinstate the historic arrangement of farm buildings in a courtyard pattern.
36. The significance of the listed buildings and the farmstead derives from the age, architectural quality, size, scale and relationship of buildings. There is a functional relationship with the adjoining land which was likely farmed as part of the farm holding and reasonable evidence to suggest that there may be an associative link with Titchfield Abbey which adds and contributes to this significance. There has been some more recent and modern infill development and recent housing within the farmstead adjacent and in the wider setting which has a negative impact and detracts from the significance. The wider setting of the site within a rural landscape assists in understanding the scale and status of the land holding, sets the farmstead in an appropriate open rural agricultural setting and separates it from the close by settlement of Titchfield. This contributes to the overall significance of these assets.
37. The proximity of the settlement of Titchfield and the exposed urban edge already have a negative impact on the wider setting of the heritage assets bringing suburban development close to the farmstead and reducing the wider rural hinterland.
38. The appeal site is formed by open land that wraps around the northern and eastern edge of the cluster of buildings within which the farmstead is set. It lies between the southern edge of Titchfield and the northern edge of the cluster of buildings and abuts the northern and eastern boundary of the farmhouse.
39. It is common ground that the proposals would not result in physical alterations to the listed buildings. There would be no loss of historic fabric or alterations to the architectural quality or form of the actual buildings. Similarly there would be no direct alteration of the farmstead.
40. Both parties also agree that the proposal would be located within the setting of the listed buildings and the farmstead. There is also agreement that the proposal would result in harm to the setting of the listed buildings by virtue of built development being closer to the buildings and reducing the rural setting of the buildings. Whilst both parties accept that the harm would be less than

substantial in terms of the Framework, the dispute arises in respect of the level of that harm. The appellant broadly contends that there are limited aspects where the effect would be perceived or experienced and with appropriate landscaping the effect would be reduced over time such that it would fall at the bottom end of the spectrum of less than substantial harm, albeit acknowledging that some harm would be occasioned. The Council on the other hand would put the harm more to the middle of the range that would be less than substantial and contend there are a number of areas where the perception would be significant, that the landscaping may reduce the effect over time, but not remove it, that the noise, activity and illumination associated with a suburban housing estate would further add to that impact and that the effect of changing that land from open rural land to suburban housing would fundamentally alter the setting and obliterate some of the functional and associative links with the adjoining land, albeit different degrees of weight were ascribed to the various elements of harm.

41. There is no dispute that the site would result in the introduction of housing on the area of land adjacent and bordering the farmstead and main farmhouse. This would bring the settlement of Titchfield up to the cluster of buildings and in effect subsume that once separate element into the broader extent of the settlement. This would reduce the connection of the existing farmstead and listed buildings to the rural hinterland and obscure the separation from the nearby settlement. The character of that change would be noticeable and harmful. It would be perceived when travelling along Posbrook Lane when leaving or entering the village and would be readily appreciated from Bellfield and the adjacent existing settlement edge. There are also public footpaths running through the land. These would be both static and kinetic views when moving along and between the various views. This would be a significant and fundamental change.
42. When viewed from the south, along Posbrook Lane and the public footpaths, travelling towards the farmstead and Titchfield the size and scale of the barn are fully appreciated, there are views available of the manorial farmhouse within these views and together the site is recognisable as a distinct farmstead. Whilst the urban edge of Titchfield is also visible it is appreciated that there is a degree of separation. The proposed development would intrude into these views and in the short to medium term would be readily distinguishable as suburban housing. In the longer-term landscaping may reduce this negative effect by the introduction of a woodland feature at its edge, which the appellant argues is reflective of the historic landscape pattern in the area. However, this would introduce a sense of enclosure around the farmstead and listed buildings that would detach them from the rural hinterland and reduce that historic functional connection with the adjoining open land. Whilst there is evidence of small wooded areas in the historic mapping these were freestanding isolated features and not so closely related to areas of built development. The point of the historic pattern in the area is the farmstead with open land around that was once farmed by the manorial farm and which would not have included such features in such proximity to the main farmstead.
43. There would also be views of the relationship between the farmhouse and the proposed development in views on the public paths to the east. Again, these would be significant and harmful in the short to medium term. There may be some reduction in that harm as landscaping matures but even with dense planting and the softening of the existing urban edge it will be an undeniable

fact that suburban development has been undertaken and that there is no separation between the settlement of Titchfield and the historic farmstead including the listed buildings.

44. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be harm to the setting of the listed buildings and historic farmstead. I would characterise that harm as less than substantial as this would not obliterate the significance of these historic assets. The proposal would however have an adverse and harmful effect on the setting of these assets which would affect their significance given the contribution that the setting makes to that significance. The urbanisation of the remaining area that separates the farmstead and listed buildings from the settlement is significant and whilst the rural hinterland remains to the south and west the dislocation from the existing built up area is an important and fundamental component of that setting that would be lost as a result of the development. The effect is therefore significant and would not in my view be at the lower end of the less than substantial scale as contended by the appellant but more in line with that suggested by the Council. The proposal would therefore conflict with development plan policy DSP5 which seeks the protection and enhancement of heritage assets and is consistent with national policy.
45. These are two Grade II* listed buildings and the Framework advises that great weight should be given to a designated heritage asset's conservation, any harm should require clear and convincing justification and assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. I also have regard to my statutory duty in respect of listed buildings and their setting. The courts have also held that any harm to a listed building or its setting is to be given considerable importance and weight. These matters are reflected in my planning balance below, which includes the Framework's 196 balance.

Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

46. The appellant undertook a survey of agricultural land and this assessment is provided in appendix SB3 of Mr Brown's proof. This identifies the limited amount of Grade 3a land (4.1 Ha) that would be affected by the development and sets this in the context of Fareham. In my view this does not trigger the sequential test in the Framework footnote 53 as significant development.
47. It is accepted that whilst there is a loss of BMVAL and that this is a negative to be weighed against the scheme it would not of itself amount to such that would justify the dismissal of the appeal. This is a point that was not refuted by the Council who accepted that it may not justify dismissal but should be weighed as a negative factor in the overall balance against the development.
48. I have no substantive evidence to depart from those views and the approach adopted is consistent with that of a colleague in an appeal at Cranleigh Road (APP/A1720/W/16/3156344).
49. The appellant's report concluded that given the grade of land, the small scale and the overall comparative effect on such land in Fareham, whilst it is a negative, it should be afforded no more than limited weight. I concur with that assessment for the views given and therefore ascribe this loss limited weight in my overall planning balance.

Other Matters

50. The Council and appellant agree that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Time was spent at the Inquiry considering the extent of the shortfall based on, amongst other matters, the correct buffer and the correct household projection base date to use. The publication of the Housing Delivery Test results confirmed that Fareham is a 5% buffer Authority. The government also confirmed that it is the 2014 based household projections that should be used as the basis for calculation of the five-year requirement under the standard method. On this basis both parties agree that the minimum five-year requirement would be 2,856 in the period 2018 to 2023.
51. The updated position of the parties is thus a 3.08 years supply taking the appellants position or a 4.36 years supply if the Council's position were to be adopted. I have been provided with further supply evidence in relation to the Old Street Inquiry which calls into question some of the supply side dwellings included in the Council's figures which were permitted since April 2018. Excluding these the appellant suggests the Council's figures would drop to 4.08 years supply.
52. Whichever figures are adopted it is clear that the Council cannot identify a five-year supply of available housing land and that the shortfall is significant. The provision of additional housing in an area where there is a significant housing shortfall in my view translates into a significant positive benefit for the scheme in terms of the overall planning balance.
53. The appeal site is located where there is potential for a significant effect on a number of European designated wildlife sites which comprise Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) potential Special Protection Areas (pSPAs) and Ramsar sites. The proposal has been subject to Habitats Regulation Assessment and a shadow Appropriate Assessment process by the appellant. Given the requirement for further publication of environmental information in association with the Environmental Statement consultation was undertaken with Natural England as the Nature Conservation Body to ensure there was no further procedural or administrative delay at the end of the process. However, given the conclusion of my assessment of the effect of the development on the wider landscape and the designated heritage assets I am not minded to allow the appeal. On this basis an Appropriate Assessment does not need to be carried out, as it is only in circumstances where I am minded to grant consent that such an assessment is required to be undertaken. Moreover, in the interim the Framework, paragraph 177 has been amended to advise that it is not the requirement to conduct Appropriate Assessment but the conclusion that following that assessment there is an identified likely significant effect on a habitats site where the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply. In these circumstances this matter does not therefore affect the approach to my planning balance.

Benefits of the Scheme

54. As noted above the provision of housing in an Authority area where the Council cannot identify a five-year housing supply is a significant benefit of the scheme. The Statement of Common Ground signed by the parties makes it clear that there is a significant need for affordable housing. The provision of 40% of the total number of units provided as affordable housing, secured

through the planning obligation, is therefore also a significant positive benefit of the scheme.

55. The appellant contends that there would be between 360 and 465 direct, indirect and induced jobs created by construction. It is further contended that there would be an on-going £4.1m gross expenditure per annum from future residents. It is further contended that the landscaping and ecological mitigation would improve the appearance of the harsh urban edge currently created by Bellfield. These are benefits that accrue from this development and are therefore reasonable to add as positive contributions in the planning balance. They are of a scale which reflects the scale of the development.
56. For these reasons the social benefits from additional housing and affordable housing are of significant positive weight, the economic benefits are of moderate positive weight, and the environmental benefits are of limited positive weight.

Planning Obligation

57. A completed Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 8 November was submitted to the Inquiry before the conclusion of it sitting. The UU secures matters related to transport including the site access, travel plan and construction traffic management as well as a contribution towards sustainable transport. The UU also secures public open space provisions, including contributions; environmental and habitat obligations, including commuted maintenance and disturbance contributions and the transfer of a bird conservation area; an education contribution and obligations to protect or provide on site routes for the public. These are in effect mitigation measures or matters directly related to the development and do not amount to positive benefits.
58. The appeal is to be dismissed on other substantive issues and whilst an obligation has been submitted, it is not necessary for me to look at it in detail, given that the proposal is unacceptable for other reasons, except insofar as it addresses affordable housing.
59. In respect of affordable housing the UU secures 40% of the housing as affordable units with the mix, tenure and location controlled by the undertaking. I have already identified this as a benefit of the scheme which will be taken into account in the planning balance.

Planning balance

60. I have concluded that the proposed development would result in material harm to the significance of two Grade II* listed buildings through development in the setting of those buildings. This harm is in my view less than substantial harm in the terms of the Framework a position also adopted by both main parties. Paragraph 196 of the Framework advises in such circumstances that this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
61. I have identified the public benefits of the scheme above and these include the provision of additional housing in an authority where there is not a five year supply of housing land and the provision of affordable housing in an area where there is a significant need. I give these matters significant weight. Added to these would be the additional jobs and expenditure in the locality arising from construction activity and following completion of the development. Given the

scale of development these would not amount to small figures and I have ascribed this moderate weight. The proposed landscaping and biodiversity enhancements are a balance and required in the context of also providing a degree of mitigation I therefore only ascribe these limited positive weight.

62. The Framework makes it clear that when considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Furthermore it advises that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. There is a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The courts have interpreted this to mean that considerable importance and weight must be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out the balancing exercise in planning decisions.
63. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. The Farm House and Barn at Great Posbrook are both Grade II* and therefore are assets of the highest significance. The development of a substantial housing estate in the rural setting of these listed buildings, and farmstead of which they form part, would materially alter the relationship of the listed buildings and farmstead to the nearby village and wider rural hinterland. This would merge the existing distinct and separated grouping of buildings with the expanding village removing that degree of separation and obscuring the historic relationship with the village and wider countryside. I would not characterise this less than substantial harm as of such limited effect as 'at the lower end' within that spectrum as suggested by the appellant. Indeed, the setting contributes to the significance of these listed buildings and their appreciation from both distinct view points and kinetic views. The negative effect would have a measurable and noticeable effect on the existing physical relationships of development in the area and thereby the understanding of the historic development of those over time. The understanding of the high status nature of the house and barn, and their significance, is derived in part from an appreciation of the separation from the village, their setting within the wider agricultural and rural hinterland as well as their size, scale, architectural quality and relationship of the buildings to each other and the surrounding development.
64. On the basis of the above I conclude that the less than substantial harm I have identified, and to which I give considerable importance and weight, is not outweighed by the significant public benefits of the scheme. On this basis I conclude that the scheme should be resisted. As the scheme fails the paragraph 196 test this would disengage the paragraph 11 d tilted balance that would otherwise have been in play given the lack of a five-year supply of housing land.
65. The scheme would be subject to the requirement to carry out an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations if I were minded to allow the appeal. At the time of submission of the appeal Paragraph 177 of the Framework required that the presumption in favour of sustainable development, in paragraph 11, would not apply where an Appropriate Assessment was required to be carried out. The latest iteration of the Framework has amended paragraph 177 to only disengage the presumption in favour of sustainable development where the development is likely to have a

significant effect on a habitats site. If an Appropriate Assessment has concluded the development would not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site the presumption would not be disengaged. However, given my conclusions in respect of the impact on heritage assets and the other harms I have identified I am not minded to allow the appeal and therefore I do not need to carry out an Appropriate Assessment.

66. Whilst the presumption in favour of sustainable development is not disengaged by virtue of paragraph 177 of the Framework, paragraph 11 d, the so called 'tilted balance', is disengaged by virtue of my conclusions in relation to the effect on the heritage assets and the application of 11 d i. The proposal therefore is to be considered in the context of a straight balance. Section 38(6) requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. I have concluded that the proposal would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area, which is a valued landscape, to the setting of two Grade II* listed buildings and a minor adverse effect on best and most versatile agricultural land in the area. On this basis the proposal would conflict with policy CS14 in the LPP1 and DSP5, DSP6 and DSP40 in the LPP2.
67. The Authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land and policies which restrict housing development through such matters as settlement boundaries and gaps are out of date. They do not provide for the necessary housing to make provision for adequate housing in the area. However, those policies, which include CS14, CS22 and DSP6 do seek to protect the countryside and fulfil a purpose that is consistent with the Framework. The Council is seeking to address the shortfall and is making positive steps in that regard albeit there is dispute as to how successful that is. Nevertheless matters are moving forward and although there is still an outstanding shortfall, which even if I accept is as great as suggested by the appellant, is improving on historic figures and there appears to be greater opportunities for this situation to be improved further. I accept that Welbourne may well not be moving at the pace that has previously been suggested and not as quickly as the Council would suggest, but it is still moving forward and with a significant complex development of this nature matters will take time but once milestones are reached momentum is likely to quicken. Of particular relevance here is the determination of the extant application, which remains undetermined but continues to move forward. On the basis of the information before me the determination of this would be in the spring or middle of this year. Given the above I do not afford these particular policies the full weight of the development plan but I still accept that they have significant weight and the conflict with those policies that I have identified above still attracts significant weight in my planning balance.
68. I note that policy DSP5 reiterates national policy and reflects the statutory duty and is therefore accorded full weight and conflict with it, as I have found in this regard, is afforded substantial weight. The contingency of Policy DSP40 has been engaged by virtue of the lack of a five year housing land supply and it is for these very purposes that the policy was drafted in that way. On that basis the policy has full weight and any conflict with it is also of significant weight. In the context of the harms I have identified which relate to landscape, heritage assets and best and most versatile agricultural land these result in conflicts with specific criteria in policy DSP40 for the reasons given above in respect of those matters and therefore there is conflict with the policy. These

are two significant policies where weight has not been reduced and the proposal when considered in the round is not in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole.

69. The ecological provisions payments and additional bird sanctuary are primarily mitigation requirements resultant from the proposed development and its likely potential effects and do not therefore substantively add a positive contribution to the overall balance.
70. The impact on the significance of the Grade II* listed buildings is not outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme and therefore the additional harms related to landscape and BMVAL only add further to the weight against the proposal. The advice in the Framework supports the conclusions to resist the proposal. There are therefore no material considerations that indicate that a decision other than in accordance with the development plan would be appropriate.

Overall conclusion

71. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Christopher Boyle QC

Instructed by Woolf Bond Planning LLP

He called:

Jeremy Smith BSc
(Hons), DipLA, CMLI
Ignus Froneman
B.Arch.Stud, ACIfA,
IHBC

SLR Consulting Limited

Heritage Collective UK Limited

Stephen Brown BSc
(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Woolf Bond Planning LLP

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Paul Stinchcombe QC
& Richard Wald

Instructed by Southampton and Fareham Legal
Partnership

He called:

Andy Blaxland BA
(Hons), DipTP, Dip Mgt,
MRTPI

Adams Hendry Consulting

Lucy Markham MRTPI
IHBC

Montagu Evans

Philip Brashaw BSc
(Hons) BLD, CMLI

LDA Design

FOR THE TITCHFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM :

David Phelan

Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Nick Girdler
Robert Marshall
William Hutchison
Linda Davies

Chairman Titchfield Village Trust
Member of Fareham Society
Chairman Hillhead Residents Association
Local Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT INQUIRY BY APPELLANT

- APP1 Housing Land Supply Statement of Common Ground.
- APP2 Press Release dated 18 October 2018 from Fareham Borough Council.
- APP3 Appeal Decision letter APP/W3520/W/18/3194926.
- APP4 Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening & Shadow Appropriate Assessment prepared by CSA Environmental.
- APP5 Unilateral Undertaking dated 8 November 2018.
- APP6 Bundle of three Committee reports (P/17/1317/OA, P/18/0235/FP and P/18/0484/FP) confirming the Council's approach to Policy DSP40.
- APP7 Additional suggested conditions.
- APP8 Letter from Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust confirming their agreement to take on the land secured as the Bird Conservation Area in the Unilateral Undertaking.
- APP9 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT INQUIRY BY LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

- LPA1 List of Appearances on behalf of the Council
- LPA2 Updated extract from 'The Buildings of England Hampshire: South', appendix 14b to Ms Markham's proof of evidence.
- LPA3 Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy: Titchfield Abbey, Fareham Borough Council adopted sept 2013 – substitution for Core Document F11.
- LPA4 Appeal Decision letter APP/W1715/W/17/3173253.
- LPA5 Copy of Policies 1CO and 2CO from the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan.
- LPA6 Announcement from the Leader of Fareham Borough Council dated 5 November 2018.
- LPA7 S106 Obligations Justification Statement.
- LPA8 Opening submissions on behalf of the Council.
- LPA9 List of documents to be referred to during Evidence in Chief of Philip Brshaw.
- LPA10 List of documents to be referred to during Evidence in Chief of Lucy Markham.
- LPA11 Draft schedule of conditions.
- LPA12 e-mail from Strategic Development Officer Children's Services Department Hampshire County Council dated 8 November 2018.
- LPA13 Plan of route and points from which to view the site during the appeal site visit.
- LPA14 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT INQUIRY BY TITCHFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

- TNF1 Opening statement on behalf of Titchfield neighbourhood Forum
- TNF2 Email exchange with appellant regarding drainage dated 6 November including various attachments
- TNF3 List of documents referred to in Evidence in Chief of Mr Phelan
- TNF4 Closing Statement on behalf of Titchfeild neighbourhood Forum

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT INQUIRY BY THIRD PARTIES

INQ1 Speaking note from Mr Girdler
INQ2 Letter read out by Mr Marshal on behalf of The Fareham Society
INQ3 Speaking note from Mr Hutcinson

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER INQUIRY

PID1 Additional Environmental Information submitted by appellant under cover of letter dated 14 December 2018.
PID2 Copy of Press notice of publication of Additional Environmental Information.
PID3 Comments on Additional Environmental Information by Titchfield neighbourhood Forum.
PID4 Comments on Additional Environmental Information by Fareham Borough Council.
PID5 'Old Street' Appeal decision APP/A1720/W/18/3200409 submitted by Fareham Borough Council
PID6 Fareham Borough Council comments on 'Old Street' decision.
PID7 Appellant's comments on 'Old Street' decision.
PID8 Natural England's (NE) consultation response on shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment as Statutory nature Conservation Body.
PID9 Appellant's response to NE's consultation response (PID8) including an updated shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment.
PID10 Titchfield neighbourhood Forum's response to NE's consultation response (PID8)
PID11 Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum's comments on the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results and the changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
PID12 Fareham Borough Council's comments on the HDT results and the changes to the Framework.
PID13 Appellant's comments on the HDT results and the changes to the Framework.
PID14 Titchfield Neighbourhood Forum's final comments on HDT and Framework
PID15 Appellant's final comments on HDT and Framework.

END