

the farmhouse and its garden, although they are seen in the context of the recent housing, so the historic functional relationship is less clear here than in views from the south. Immediately to the west of the farmhouse, in the grounds of Old Barn Cottage, there is a small C18 or C19 barn/granary, and the converted piggery can be seen from the west end of the listed farmhouse.

- 7.23 The former farmstead is located on the east side of Posbrook Lane, and there are some late C19 estate workers cottages to the immediate south-west. Otherwise, the former farmstead is surrounded by open fields, and this open landscape is important to the understanding that this was originally an historic farmstead, and the appreciation of the significance of the listed building as a former farmhouse.
- 7.24 Although there is very limited intervisibility because of the trees along the boundary, the post-WWII Council housing to the south of Titchfield does adversely affect the experience of the listed farmhouse, because its proximity (c. 190m to the north) reduces the sense of the farmstead being in open countryside. This post-WWII housing can be seen with glimpses of the farmhouse from the PROW to the south (see LVIA view 7, CD.D6).
- 7.25 As an open field, the Appeal Site therefore makes an important contribution to the appreciation of the significance of the listed building as a former farmhouse. There is also a historic functional relationship between the land and the farmhouse, because it historically formed part of the farmland, although I would not place too much weight on this factor alone.

**Barn, Grade II* Listed
Significance**

- 7.26 The barn is also grade II* listed, so is a highly graded asset. The barn is of considerable historic interest because of the age of its fabric, which has been reliably dated to between 1570 and 1622 by dendrochronology. The barn is post-Dissolution but its substantial scale and the fine roof carpentry are reminiscent of earlier examples, such as the Titchfield Abbey monastic barn, which may explain why HE attributed it as late medieval in the list description, without the benefit of the dendrochronology. The HE Listing Selection Guide for Agricultural Buildings (**Appendix 13a**) notes that clear dating adds to the historic interest of the building.
- 7.27 It is a very large aisled barn which illustrates the high status and wealth of Great Posbrook manor at this date. The wagon entrance and opposing doors indicate it was used for threshing, which is of historic interest illustrating agricultural processes prior to the Industrial revolution. I was unable to gain access to this part of the barn to establish whether the threshing floor survives.
- 7.28 The roof structure is of architectural interest: it is a Queen-Strut roof with mostly arched braces, which was a common roof form from the late C16 into the C19. The large timbers and arches braces indicate its early date. The repairs to the roof structure have been sensitive using modern timber and its low key use as garages and for storage, which does not require permanent subdivision, is appropriate. The roof covering of

- 8.23 Mr Froneman has argued that when the landscape screening to the south is mature (as shown in the year view 17 photomontage of views 6 and 7 in the LVIA, **CD.D6**), it will "*illustrate an absence of development juxtaposed with the former farmstead*". I strongly disagree.
- 8.24 First and fundamentally, I am not convinced by the photomontages and consider that some glimpses of buildings would be visible at this proximity.
- 8.25 Second, this is a kinetic view. As one moved north along the PROW, and entered the housing development, it would be obvious that their setting to the east was developed, and not open farmland.
- 8.26 Third, even if the landscape screening is this complete (which I don't think it would be), the character of the view will have changed. The planting would increase the sense of enclosure and screen views of the Meon valley. The farmstead would appear to be bordered by woodland to the east, rather than open fields as it is now and has been historically.
- 8.27 Fourth, aside from the visual effect, the character of the land would have fundamentally changed from open agricultural land to suburban housing development, so the argument that there would be a "sense of an absence of development" from this viewpoint is not relevant (or accurate).
- 8.28 There would also be non-visual effects to the listed farmhouse resulting from the close proximity to a new housing development including noise, movement and light spill. I recognise that there are already similar effects from the houses in Barn Close and Posbrook House (to the north of the former farmstead); however, the proposed development would surround the farmhouse with these effects.
- 8.29 There is a historic functional relationship, between the Appeal Site and listed buildings, because the land on the Appeal Site was farmed from Great Posbrook. The proposed development would make it more difficult to appreciate this historic functional relationship. This is material to the setting assessment, but I do not place too much emphasis upon it on its own, if there were not the other effects. I mean that it would be possible to develop some other land which was formerly farmed from Great Posbrook with housing, without harming its setting and appreciation of significance. The proximity to the former farmstead is determinative.
- 8.30 The diminution in the understanding that the barn and farmhouse were part of an historic farmstead would reduce the appreciation of the significant historic functional relationship with Titchfield Abbey. Great Posbrook was a monastic farmstead and if it becomes more difficult to understand that it was formerly a farm, the historic link with Titchfield Abbey would become more obscure. I do not place significant weight on this factor but it is material.
- 8.31 I have identified no positive heritage effects from the development, and nor has the Appellant. For example there will be no changes to public access or use of the listed