

CASE OFFICER'S REPORT

Application Reference:	PL/2025/09512
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Consultation Ends:	06/01/26
Case Officer:	Joe Richardson

Site Address:	Manor Farmhouse, East Grimstead, Wiltshire, SP5 3RT
----------------------	---

Proposal:	Erection of a dwelling with associated works
------------------	--

Recommendation:	Refuse
------------------------	--------

Site Description/Proposal:

The application site relates to a large plot of land owned by the occupiers/owners of Manor Farm House that surrounds the property. Land to the south of this dwellinghouse is currently used as paddocks for the stationing of horses/ponies and alpacas. Other livestock such as sheep have grazed the land in the summer months. Upon the land subject to this proposal are two stable blocks for the fore-mentioned livestock. The land benefits from recent planning consent, PL/2025/03227 for the erection of barn/stable block and a change of use land from agricultural to a mixed use of agriculture/equestrian use. This permission has not yet been implemented.

The site forms part of a large open field situated on the edge of the village of East Grimstead and lies in a slightly elevated position in relation to the public highway (Grimstead Road) that runs along the western boundary of the application site which is bounded by mature trees and hedgerow. The dwellinghouse known as Wellmead Barn is adjacent to the site entrance of the application site and other properties known as Laburnum House, Taw Cottage, Hollydene House. Oak Barn Cottage, Manor Cottage are in reasonable proximity.

An extract taken from the submitted existing location plan (DWG No: A-16-202) shows the site below with the two existing stable blocks. To the east and south of the application site are the public rights of way known as GRIM1 and GRIM5. The site is within the Special Landscape Area (SLA), Flood Zone 1, in an area that is at low risk of ground water flooding, is within the River Test SAC catchment area and is within the 13.8km New Forest Recreation Zone of Influence.



Core Policies CP1 (Settlement Strategy) and CP2 (Delivery Strategy) form the settlement strategy for the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS). It is evident that the site subject to this planning application is outside of the defined settlement boundary of East Grimstead and therefore, for the purposes of the local plan, is within the open countryside.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a dwellinghouse and associated works. An extract below taken from the proposed block plan (DWG No: A-05-303 Rev B) shows the layout of the dwellinghouse with the red line and the blue line denoting the land within the applicant's ownership.



Relevant Planning History:

17/12401/OUT – Erection of detached dwelling (Access and layout only – all other matters reserved) REF 22/02/18 Dismissed on appeal 10.12.18

PL/2023/05974 – Detached garage and garden store with ancillary accommodation A.C 08.03.24

PL/2024/09349 – Single storey side extension, two storey rear extension A.C 10.12.24

PL/2025/02210 – Erection of a two bedroom annexe to serve Manor Farmhouse WTD on Officer Advice 14.05.25

PL/2025/03227 - Change of use of land from agricultural to a mixed use of equestrian/agriculture and the erection of a barn/stable block A.C 10.09.25

POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 2 Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 11 Making Effective Use of Land

Section 12 Achieving Well Designed Places

Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Wiltshire Core Strategy

Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy

Core Policy 2 Delivery Strategy

Core Policy 23 Southern Wiltshire Community Area
Core Policy 48 Supporting Rural Life
Core Policy 50 and 52 Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Core Policy 51 Landscaping
Core Policy 57 Ensuring high quality design and place shaping
Core Policy 61 Transport and Development
Core Policy 64 Demand Management

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2015-2026: Car Parking and Cycling Strategy
Creating Places Design Guide SPD (April 2006)
National Design Guide 2021
Wiltshire Design Guide 2024

Emerging Local Plan

Salisbury District Local Plan
C6 - Special Landscape Area

ISSUES

- Principle of development including site history;
- Housing Land Supply position;
- Design and scale and amenity impacts including SLA;
- Highway safety/parking;
- Ecological Impact including the River Test SAC, New Forest SPA and BNG;
- Drainage;
- Archaeological Impact

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Grimstead Parish Council – Objection with comments received stating:

Grimstead Parish Council objects strongly to this application, and noted the considerable increase in community feeling against this application as well at its meeting of 5th January 2026. The Parish Council's fundamental objections are the same as those raised against the previous application for the barn (PL/2025/03227), and is concerned particularly about the increased impact a house would have on the local environment and infrastructure compared to the barn, due to the change and intensification of use. Light pollution will be an issue. The house remains an overdevelopment of the site, and the ridge being 10m from the road level, will be an overbearing and dominating structure in the rural street scene. The Parish Council feels strongly that the reasons for refusing a previous application - 17/12401/OUT apply equally here. The Parish Council has requested that this application be called into the Southern Planning Committee for determination is the Case Officer is minded to approve, as it feels Wiltshire Council should thoroughly assess the cumulative impact of these recent applications for the site together with the planning history. A site visit by the Planning Committee is also strongly recommended. The Parish Council also wonders, if the application is approved, whether it will be faced with another application for a barn, originally required to help manage the animals and other agricultural activities.

WC Highways – No objection subject to conditions with comments received stating:

The site is located in the village of East Grimstead off the classified C323 Dean Road. East Grimstead does not have a development boundary and I will be guided by you as to whether you consider the proposal to be contrary to policies CP57 (xiv), CP60(i) and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the NPPF 2024 paras 109-111 which seek to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car, and support and encourage sustainable, safe and efficient movement of people and goods. The proposal includes adequate off street parking to meet Wiltshire's current parking standards. Although possible a turning manoeuvre to enable vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear will be tight and I recommend for the ease of applicants the parking and turning area is enlarged. The proposal will utilise an existing vehicle access which is considered adequate. Should you be minded to support the development, I raise no highway objection, providing the following condition is imposed:

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the turning area & parking spaces [3] have been completed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans. The areas shall always be maintained for those purposes thereafter and maintained free from the storage of materials.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

WC Ecology – No objection subject to conditions – please refer to the Ecological section of this report for full comments.

Conditions to be imposed:

Compliance with the New Forest SPA

Water Usage

Installation of proposed PTP;

Details of ecological enhancements to be provided

WC Drainage – No objection subject to a condition requiring a surface water drainage strategy

WC Archaeology – No objection with comments received stating:

Manor Farmhouse, East Grimstead, is an early 19th-century, unlisted dwelling lying within the historic village of East Grimstead. The Farmhouse lies some distance north of the proposed location of the new dwelling, which lies in a paddock in which Wiltshire's Historic Environment Record (HER) notes linear crop marks recorded on aerial photographs dating to the 1970s. It is speculated that these crop marks might relate to features associated with the medieval village. The site of the new dwelling was previously subject to an approved application (PL/2025/03227) for a new barn/stable, which received no response from the Archaeology Service. On this basis and in view of the uncertain archaeological potential, I have no archaeological concerns with this proposal, and no further action is required as regards the buried archaeological heritage in relation to this planning application.

Third party representations – 9 x letters of objection with comments received summarised as the following:

- The existing stables and access do not have any planning permission;
- Area is already waterlogged and will be increased;
- Lack of Drainage/Surface Water mitigation;
- Overbearing impact of the proposal on amenity of nearby properties;
- Incremental development of land within a Special Landscape Area;
- Ecological species will be disturbed;
- Site is outside of any settlement boundary;

- Environmental impact of building a large 5 bedroom property;
- Limited infrastructure within East Grimstead;
- Proposal is overbearing, will dominate the landscape/vernacular and dominate the landscape;
- Overlooking of the surrounding area given the site is significantly raised above road level;
- Loss of agricultural land;
- Principle of residential development on the land is unsustainable and contrary to planning policies;
- Inconsistencies within the submitted planning statement in comparison to application PL/2025/03227;
- Correct consultation processes were not followed regarding consultation for the previous application;
- The applicant is blatantly ignoring conditions imposed on application PL/2025/03227;
- Several attempts by previous owners to get permission for a residential property within the area have failed;
- More affordable housing is required in the area, not more large houses;
- The proposed hedgerow screening for the development is insufficient;
- Proposal is not in-keeping with the general vernacular of the village;
- Light pollution.

Call-in of application:

Should officers be minded to recommend approval of this proposal, Cllr Cooper has 'called-in' the application to be determined by the Southern Area Planning Committee on the following key issues:

- Scale of development;
- Visual impact on the surround area;
- Relationship to adjoining properties;
- Design – bulk, height, general appearance;
- Environmental/highway impact

Other reasons are stated as the following:

The site was identified as having a change of use of land and approval of the barn. Given the previous applications on this site, it is worthy of a public examination of this application.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of development including site history

The Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) sets out a Settlement Strategy and a Delivery Strategy for the sustainable delivery of new development within the County. Applying the normal principle that applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; proposed new development which does not comply with the Settlement and Delivery Strategies will be unsustainable, and so unacceptable as a matter of principle, in this overarching context. The WCS for the area was adopted by Wiltshire Council in January 2015.

Core Policies CP1 (Settlement Strategy) and CP2 (Delivery Strategy) form the settlement strategy for the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS). The village of East Grimstead is identified as a small village in the WCS where the settlement boundary has been removed and therefore has no defined limits of development/settlement boundary. The site subject to this planning application is outside of the defined settlement boundary of East Grimstead and therefore, for the purposes of the local plan, is within the open countryside.

Core Policy 2 Delivery Strategy sets out the housing and employment land targets for the County, and the locations where these facilities can be delivered in the most sustainable manner. The policy goes on to state that within the limits of development, as defined on the proposals map, there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development at the Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages.

The policy then goes on to consider schemes outside the defined limits of development, where development will not be permitted unless it meets the criteria set out in policy CP 34 (additional employment land), CP 37 (military establishments), CP 39 and 40 (development related to tourism), CP 44 (rural exception sites), CP 46 and 47 (specialist accommodation provision) and CP 48 (supporting rural life) or in Small Villages that development will be limited to infill within the existing built area. Proposals for development at the Small Villages will be supported where they seek to meet housing needs of settlements or provide employment, services and facilities provided that the development:

- i) Respects the existing character and form of the settlement
- ii) Does not elongate the village or impose development in sensitive landscape areas
- iii) Does not consolidate an existing sporadic loose knit areas of development related to the settlement

Officers are aware of application, 17/12401/OUT that sought permission for the erection of a detached dwelling within the grounds of Manor Farmhouse approximately 50metres south to the location of this proposal. This application was refused and subsequently, dismissed on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (APP/Y3940/W/18/3199876). This appeal decision is a material consideration of this planning application. The application subject to this scheme would utilise the existing access/egress as per the refused application, 17/12401/OUT. For comparative purposes, the proposed layouts are shown below



Proposed layout (above)

Layout of refused app 17/12401/OUT (above)

The refused application, 17/12401/OUT was dismissed on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate. Officers note paragraph 8 of the appeal decision confirms that the proposal for the erection of a dwellinghouse does not constitute an infill development and would consequently conflict with Core Policy CP2 of the WCS. This paragraph is shown below:

8. Paragraph 4.29 of the WCS states that 'for the purposes of Core Policy 2, infill is defined as the filling of a small gap within the village that is only large enough for not more than a few dwellings, generally only one dwelling'. In this instance, the appeal site forms part of a larger arable field and could not be considered to be filling a small gap within the village. I therefore consider that the proposal would not constitute an infill development, and would consequently conflict with Core Policy 2 of the WCS. This policy adds that development proposals are also required to respect the existing character and form of the settlement, not to elongate the village or impose development in sensitive landscape areas and not to consolidate existing loose knit areas of development related to the settlement. Whilst it may be argued that the proposal would be in accordance with some aspects of Core Policy 2, by not altering the form of the settlement or elongating the village, this would not outweigh the conflict I have otherwise found with the first strand of this policy.

Officers consider there is little difference between this application and that of the refused application, 17/12401/OUT. As set out by the Inspector above, infill is defined at paragraph 4.29 of the WCS as 'the filling of a small gap within the village that is only large enough for not more than a few dwellings, generally only one'.

The scheme would not adhere to the infill policy as defined within Core Policy 2 of the WCS in that the development does not respect the existing character and form of the settlement (criterion i). As a consequence, the site is considered to be in an unsustainable location for the proposed residential development, having regard to the spatial strategy of the development plan, likely scale and layout of the built form within the plot of land and site's accessibility to facilities and services. Therefore, the development proposal is unacceptable in principle.

In addition to the criteria of Core Policy 2 set out above, Core Policies 60 and 61 require, amongst other things, development to support sustainable patterns of development, reduce the need to travel particularly by private car, and encourage sustainable and safe movement of people within Wiltshire. The site location would not facilitate this or encourage use of sustainable modes of transport. Future occupiers of the site would need to travel significant distances via narrow rural highways to access a range of essential services further adding to the LPA's argument that the principle of the development is unacceptable in this case.

Furthermore, within the planning statement accompanying this application, reference is made to the approved barn/stable block (our ref: PL/2025/03227) being considered as a fallback position should this scheme not be approved. Reference is made to the case law judgement for *Mansell v Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council*. This case concerned a planning permission for the demolition of a barn and bungalow and replacement with four dwellings. The scheme was granted planning permission partly because the applicant could alternatively use Class Q permitted development rights to convert the agricultural building into up to three dwellings, with the existing bungalow remaining, a potential fallback scenario. Whilst this was challenged, the Court held the Council had acted lawfully in that the Class Q fallback was realistic enough to be considered by virtue of the existing agricultural building on site.

The crux of the matter when applying this case law judgement to this scheme is that the agricultural barn/stable block approved under PL/2025/03227 has not yet been implemented and therefore, does not benefit from any Class Q permitted development rights to be converted into a dwellinghouse. Therefore, the fallback position as argued within the planning statement does not exist.

Housing Land Supply position

The Local Planning Authority (LPA) can currently demonstrate a 2.42 years housing land supply which is a significant shortfall. The presumption in favour of sustainable development ('tilted balance') as set out in paragraph 11 (d) of the NPPF therefore applies to the determination of applications in Wiltshire at this current time.

As above, it is acknowledged that currently the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and therefore, the additional dwelling proposed by way of this scheme is a consideration within the planning balance for the determination of this application.

In this case the proposed development would provide one new dwelling, which in housing supply terms, would make a nominal contribution towards addressing the shortfall. This benefit is considered in more detail within the Planning Balance section of this report.

Notwithstanding the above, all other matters are considered in more detail below.

Design, scale and amenity impacts including SLA

At a local level, WCS policy CP57 (Ensuring High Quality Design & Place Shaping), further requires a high standard of design in all new developments through, in particular, enhancing local distinctiveness; retaining and enhancing existing important landscaping and natural features; being sympathetic to and conserving historic buildings and landscapes in terms of layouts, massing, building heights and plot sizes; and making efficient use of land whilst taking into account the local context and surrounding uses.

The revised NPPF puts greater emphasis on the need for good design. Paragraph 135 sets out that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area; demonstrate good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; be sympathetic to local character; and establish a sense of place. It states at Paragraph 139 that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Core Policy 57 also requires that development should ensure the impact on the amenities of existing occupants is acceptable, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, and the NPPF (paragraph 135f) states that planning decisions should 'create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.'

The location of the application site is on the outskirts of the village of East Grimstead and therefore, for the purposes of the local plan, is within the open countryside. There are sporadic residential properties within proximity to the application site that include the dwellinghouses known as Laburnum House, Taw Cottage, Hollydene House, Oak Barn Cottage and Manor Cottage. Adjacent to the entrance to the application site, is the dwellinghouse known as Wellmead Barn.

Also of relevance is WCS policy CP51 (Landscaping) that states: *Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and must not have a harmful*

impact upon landscape character, while any negative impacts must be mitigated as far as possible through sensitive design and landscape measures.

In addition to its countryside village location, the site forms part of a Special Landscape Area (SLA) per policy C6 of the saved Salisbury District Local Plan (SDLP). This policy states that whilst generally not of as such high quality as within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now referred to as the National Landscape), some areas are considered worthy of being preserved. As such, in accordance with saved policy C6, development proposals are required to be sympathetic and appropriate to the landscape, having regard to scale, sitting, landscaping and design.

The proposed dwellinghouse is to be sited perpendicular to the location of the previously approved barn/stable block under planning consent, PL/2025/03327 and would replace two existing stable blocks that do not benefit from planning permission. Whilst these stable blocks are unauthorised from a planning permission perspective, these types of buildings are typically found in rural locations such as this.

In terms of the scale and massing of the dwellinghouse, this is identical to that of the previously approved barn/stable block. The approved elevations under the previous consent and proposed elevations are shown below from comparative purposes.



Previously approved (above)

Proposed (above)

As shown above, the appearance of the proposed dwellinghouse is in stark contrast to that of the previously approved agricultural barn/stable block with a large degree of glazing on all elevations and roofslopes added offering views of the surrounding area and to an extent, to Wellmead Barn, that is immediately adjacent to the site. Whilst materials to be used in the construction of the building would be the same as approved previously, the scheme proposes an entirely different use that would in officer opinion result in associated domestic paraphernalia, leading to the suburbanisation of the existing rural setting to the detriment of the character of the countryside setting. This view is echoed by the Inspector in paragraph 15 of the previous appeal decision which states:

15. With its associated domestic paraphernalia, the proposal would inevitably lead to the suburbanisation of an essentially rural setting, to the detriment of the intrinsic character, openness and beauty of the countryside. Contrary to what is suggested by the appellant, the screening provided by the existing landscaping would only be partial, and would not, in my view, successfully mitigate against the harm caused by the proposal.

Comments received regarding the level of shielding provided by the existing hedgerow as stated within the planning statement and comments from members of the public are duly noted. Given the elevated location of the site from the public highway, the scheme would not

fully mitigate against the harm caused by this proposal to the amenity of the immediate area, namely Wellmead Barn or to the wider countryside setting.



The proximity of Wellmead Barn to the siting of the new dwellinghouse is shown in the photographs and aerial photograph obtained from Council held records above. Wellmead Barn is shown by the blue dot shown the aerial photograph. When having consideration for the requirements of Core Policies CP51 and CP57 of the WCS and saved policy C6 of the Salisbury District Local Plan, the new dwelling is considered to have a detrimental impact to the amenity of this property by way of the overbearing nature of the scheme. Whilst there is existing hedgerow that runs along the boundary of the site that offers a degree of shielding, this hedgerow is deciduous, the application site is elevated from the public highway and therefore, given the relationship of the neighbouring property, Wellmead Barn would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of this dwellinghouse. As a consequence, the siting and overall design of the dwellinghouse fails to respect the prevailing character and form of the area and; given the proximity of the new dwellinghouse would result in an unneighbourly relationship to Wellmead Barn.

Having regard for the bridleway/public rights of way known as GRIM1 and GRIM5 that runs around the southern and western boundaries of the site, whilst views of the proposed dwellinghouse would be visible from this vantage points, there would in officer opinion, not be any adverse impact to users of these bridleways/public rights of way to warrant refusal of planning permission.

Highway safety/parking

The site benefits from an existing access/egress obtained from Grimstead Road and this access/egress is unaltered by this proposal.

The Council's Highways Officer has assessed this proposal and has no objection to this scheme by way of the parking proposed in relation to the adopted parking strategy of Wiltshire Council. Further comments are made about manoeuvrability and whilst tight, it is recommended that parking and turning are enlarged within the site. However, no objection is raised to this element of the proposal.

Notwithstanding the above, comments are raised about the location of the site being outside of any development boundary and thus, the scheme could be considered as being contrary to Core Policies CP60 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Core Policies 60 and 61 of the adopted WCS requires that new development should be located and designed to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car, and to encourage the use of sustainable transport alternatives and that the proposal is capable of being served by safe access to the highway network. It is noted that paragraph 110 of NPPF recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. However, this does not negate the need for new housing sites to be well-connected to a range of local services to support day-to-day living. Given the location of the site at East Grimstead, it is very likely that future occupiers of this dwellinghouse will heavily rely on the use of private motor vehicles to access essential services and employment.

As a consequence, officers consider the site to be in an unsustainable location contrary to the requirements of Core Policies CP60 and CP61 of the WCS and paragraph 110 of the NPPF.

Ecological Impact including the River Test SAC, New Forest SPA and BNG

CP50 and CP52 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework require that the planning authority ensures protection of important habitats and species in relation to development and seeks enhancement for the benefit of biodiversity through the planning system. It will therefore be necessary to assess the site for its potential to support habitats and species of importance to nature conservation.

The application is accompanied by an Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) undertaken by Pro Vision dated November 2025 that has been assessed by the Council's Ecology Team.

Comments received from the Ecology Team state:

Information considered:

- Planning Statement, Atlas Planning Group, November 2025
- Natural England Nutrient Neutrality budget calculator for the Solent Marine Sites
- Product sheet for One2Clean, GRAF
- PIA certificate for One2Clean wastewater treatment tank
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Pro Vision Ecology, November 2025
- Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, Pro Vision Ecology, November 2025
- Statutory Biodiversity Metric, Jake Purchase, 25/11/2025
- Condition assessment sheets
- Proposed Block Plan, David Brazier ARB, A-05-303 revision B

The site comprises an area of agricultural land where it is proposed to construct one dwelling. A previous proposal for the construction of one barn in the same location (PL/2025/03227) was approved; the current application proposes a dwelling instead. A new Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been submitted, though it is noted that an update site visit has not been undertaken since December 2024.

A location plan for the proposed PTP has been provided. As such, there are no outstanding ecology concerns, and this response assumes that the applicant will be proceeding with the Council's strategic nitrogen credits scheme.

COMMENTS:

River Test catchment

This development falls within the River Test catchment which drains into the Solent. This region is protected by a number of international designations and the proposal has the potential for adverse effects alone or in combination to the Solent designated sites (Solent Maritime SAC, Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA)) with other developments through increased nitrogen in the catchment. In line with Natural England's Advice on Nutrient Neutrality, a calculation of the nitrogen burdens of the proposal is required. Natural England has issued guidance and a calculator tool to be used by applicants and this is available here: [Solent: nutrient neutrality calculator - GOV.UK](#). A nitrogen budget has been submitted. The nitrogen budget indicates that a GRAF One2Clean PTP will be installed, with the details in the budget corresponding with the submitted PIA certificate.

A location map has now been provided, showing that the PTP will be sited within the redline boundary. No further information is required.

Overall, the budget is in line with Natural England's advice and it is agreed that the development will result in a nitrogen burden of 2.2 kg/N/yr and mitigation is required. Wiltshire Council has a strategic nitrogen mitigation scheme to available to applicants located in the River Test catchment in Wiltshire.

The cost of Nitrogen credits from the Council's strategic scheme to mitigate the burden would be £6,138 (£2790 per 1 kg/N).

The purchase of nitrogen credits prior to the commencement of development must be secured by planning obligations. Where a Section 106 agreement is not in place, mitigation can alternatively be secured under Section 111. In such cases, the credits must be purchased upon the granting of planning permission by completion of S111 process.

Bespoke Mitigation or Alternative Strategic Scheme

Alternatively, a bespoke scheme of mitigation can be submitted provided this has been agreed with Natural England. Alternative strategic mitigation sites are available in the Solent. The latest information on mitigation options is available on the Partnership for South Hampshire website: Potential mitigation schemes available to developers - Partnership for South Hampshire (push.gov.uk).

New Forest protected sites

The proposed development site lies within the 13.8km zone of influence for the New Forest internationally protected sites, which comprises the New Forest SPA, New Forest SAC and New Forest Ramsar site. Many of the special features of the New Forest protected sites afforded protection are vulnerable to adverse effects associated with an increase in recreation as demonstrated in Natural England's supplementary advice issued for the SPA on 19 March 2019 and for the SAC on 18 March 2019.

Following a Cabinet decision on 7 May 2024, Wiltshire Council's "Interim recreation mitigation strategy for the New Forest internationally protected sites" (Version 1.1, 21 March 2023) is being revised. Cabinet approved revised mitigation measures to manage recreational pressures on the New Forest protected sites, including the cessation of use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to fund Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures for minor residential development (1-49 dwellings) and tourism / visitor

accommodation within the 13.8km zone of influence. Instead, SAMM measures are to be funded by developer contributions at a rate of £612 (plus legal fees) per unit of residential or tourism accommodation. This revision applies to all development that will result in a net increase in accommodation units within the 13.8km zone of influence from the New Forest protected sites and therefore applies to this application. Evidence for the revised approach derives from the New Forest SAMM Report (Footprint Ecology, October 2023) which can be found here: [Research into recreational use of the New Forest's protected habitats - New Forest National Park Authority \(newforestnpa.gov.uk\)](https://newforestnpa.gov.uk/research-into-recreational-use-of-the-new-forest-protected-habitats). The New Forest SAMM Report was commissioned by all the local planning authorities with areas lying within the 13.8km zone, in order to identify and implement a consistent strategic approach to mitigation across the zone of influence. It will therefore be necessary for developer contributions of £612 per dwelling (plus legal fees) to be secured via s111 agreement, unilateral undertaking or s106 agreement for this application to ensure the necessary mitigation is secured. This will enable the Council to conclude, subject to endorsement from Natural England, that the development proposed by means of this application will not lead to significant adverse effects on the New Forest protected sites alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

Other designated sites

There are two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within 2km of the site: Bentley Wood (500m east) and Brickworth Down and Dean Hill (1.5km south) (statutory-designated sites). Furthermore, there are three County Wildlife Sites (CWSs) within 1km: Brookmead Meadow 280m southwest, Hazel Hill Wood 660m northwest, and Furzy Close Copse and Horse Close Copse 1km west (non-statutory designated sites). Given the nature of the proposal, the habitats to be lost, as well as the intervening distance between the site and these designated areas, it is not considered that these sites will be adversely affected by the development.

Protected species

Bats

The stable building to be removed was assessed as having negligible potential to support roosting bats in December 2024, due to it being open-fronted and possessing no exterior or interior potential roost features. Although over one year has passed since this assessment, it is considered unlikely that the condition of the building will have changed significantly. Therefore, no further survey will be required. There are records of numerous species of bats (Brown Long-eared, Serotine, Common and Soprano Pipistrelle) within 200m of the site, and the Mottisfont Bat SAC consultation zone is 240m east. New lighting should be for the purposes for safe access and security and be in accordance with the appropriate Environmental Zone standards set out by the Institute of Lighting Engineers in their publication GN01:2021, 'Guidance for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light' (ILP, 2021), and Guidance note GN08-23 "Bats and artificial lighting at night", issued by the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Professionals. **It is recommended that a sensitive lighting scheme should be used, and a planning condition should secure biodiversity enhancements to include roosting opportunities for bats, in line with CP50 and the NPPF.**

Great Crested Newts

There are seven records of Great Crested Newts (GCNs) within 500m of the site, the closest being 320m northwest. OS maps show one pond immediately adjacent to the site, though this was not noted within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and historic aerial imagery shows it has not been present for over two decades (if ever). The nearest pond is therefore considered to be 210m west of the site, though is separated by roads and residential properties. The next nearest pond is over 250m away. The report states that the hedgerow on site (to be retained) might provide suitable terrestrial habitat for GCN, but the grassland does not since it is a short sward and not tussocky. The report therefore concluded that the proposed development poses minimal threat to GCN, and we support this finding.

Reptiles

There are historical records of Smooth and Grass Snake in the field immediately east of the site. However, the only habitat on site suitable for use by reptiles is considered to be the hedgerow (to be retained). The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal recommends continued management of the grassland to ensure the sward remains short and thus unsuitable for use by GCN or reptiles.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) this application is required to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The Biodiversity Gain Plan condition will automatically apply if approval is forthcoming. A completed statutory metric calculation (Jake Purchase, 25/03/2025), map and habitat condition assessments (Jake Purchase, survey date 04/12/2024) confirming the baseline and predicted post-development biodiversity units of Site have been submitted. The stable and hardstanding were constructed in 2022, and therefore, the baseline for the site has been assessed using historic data and satellite imagery. Prior to the construction of the stable, the site had comprised a grazed paddock since at least 2014. Information in the completed on-site baseline habitat tabs is accepted as accurate based on the information submitted. The pre-development (baseline) situation is summarised below.

On-site pre-development (baseline) biodiversity value	0.73 Habitat units
	0.10 Hedgerow units
	0.00 Watercourse units
Are there any irreplaceable habitats on-site?	No
Has any habitat degradation of occurred?	Yes – baseline taken as pre-degradation values

Confirmation of how the development will achieve BNG is a post-determination matter however consideration should be given to how any proposed BNG will be secured. It is intended that an area of land off-site (to the south of the redline boundary) would be enhanced to achieve a 10% gain. All land located outside the redline application boundary of the development site is considered off-site (refer to information here [Make off-site biodiversity gains as a developer - GOV.UK](#)).

All off-site biodiversity gains sites must be registered on the national biodiversity gains site register. Guidance on how to register a biodiversity gains site including a list of item required to apply can be found here - [Register a biodiversity gain site - GOV.UK](#). In order for the Biodiversity Gain Plan condition to be discharged all off-site gains must be shown on the Biodiversity Gain Plan as allocated to this development on the national biodiversity gains site register. Off-site gains must be secured via a legal agreement for at least 30 years. This must be a planning obligation (Section 106 agreement) or conservation covenant. Wiltshire Council will not enter into a Section 106 agreement for off-site gains unless the off-site gain site has been verified. Contact ecologychargeableservice@wiltshire.gov.uk to request further information on site verification.

If officers were minded to recommend approval for this scheme, suggested conditions as per the recommendations of the Council's Ecology Team could be imposed in respect of protected species, lighting, the River Test SAC and the New Forest SPA.

Drainage

Comments received regarding drainage and flooding matters are duly noted. The site is within Flood Zone 1, an area that is at low risk of ground water flooding. The Council's Drainage Team have been consulted upon this application and following comments are provided:

The proposed site is in Flood Zone 1 with low risk of surface water flooding. However, the existing access to the proposed site is subjected to flooding for 1 in 100-year rainfall event. Also, the site is partially at high risk of groundwater flooding with groundwater levels expected to be between 0.025m and 0.5m below the ground surface. The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a residential dwelling, together with creation of a parking area, landscaping and associated works. This application is following a previously approved application (PL/2025/03227) for the change of use of land from agriculture to a mixed use of equestrian/agriculture and the erection of a barn/stable block. Although this is not yet implemented. The building takes the identical size and siting of the recently approved agricultural barn and is located at the southern end of the wider Manor Farmhouse. No drainage strategy details are provided along with this application

The following condition is suggested to be imposed if officers are minded to recommend approval of this scheme:

- 1. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage strategy, complying with Wiltshire Council requirements, NPPF, PPG, Non Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS and the National Standards for SuDS has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

If officers were minded to recommend approval of this scheme, a condition as outlined above could have been imposed onto any consent. However, for the reasoning as outlined within other sections of this report, planning permission is to be refused.

Archaeological Impact

The Council's Archaeologist has reviewed this application and provided the following comments below:

Manor Farmhouse, East Grimstead, is an early 19th-century, unlisted dwelling lying within the historic village of East Grimstead. The Farmhouse lies some distance north of the proposed location of the new dwelling, which lies in a paddock in which Wiltshire's Historic Environment Record (HER) notes linear crop marks recorded on aerial photographs dating to the 1970s. It is speculated that these crop marks might relate to features associated with the medieval village. The site of the new dwelling was previously subject to an approved application (PL/2025/03227) for a new barn/stable, which received no response from the Archaeology Service. On this basis and in view of the uncertain archaeological potential, I have no archaeological concerns with this proposal, and no further action is required as regards the buried archaeological heritage in relation to this planning application.

As for the reasoning as outlined above, there would be no impact to any buried archaeological heritage by way of this proposal.

Planning Balance

In determining this application, the local planning authority is fully aware that if development accords with an up-to-date Local Plan it should be approved, and that proposed development

that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. It is considered that the overall strategy of the Core Strategy to direct development to the most sustainable settlements remains desirable and accords with the objectives of the NPPF.

Paragraph 11 (d) and footnote 8 of the NPPF state that where a housing land supply cannot be demonstrated then, for applications including housing provision, the policies which are most important for determining the application should be considered out-of-date. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development (often referred to as the 'tilted balance') should be applied and permission should be granted unless protection policies set out in footnote 7 of the NPPF apply, or the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The implications of the housing land supply position, and in particular the weight to be attributed to the development plan policies, must be taken into account when determining applications. The weight to be attributed to such policies is a matter of judgment for the decision-taker. The extent of the housing land supply shortfall and how it has arisen, the actions being taken to recover the shortfall, and the potential for the proposal to deliver housing in the forthcoming five-year period to help remedy the current shortfall should also be taken into account in the balancing exercise.

Therefore, as the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, the tilted balance is engaged and permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The degree of weight to be given to each issue will be weighed in the planning balance below.

Harms

The application site lies within the open countryside away from any recognised settlement identified within the Wiltshire Core Strategy and does not constitute 'infill' development. There is a general presumption against development outside the defined limits, with it being strictly controlled and only permitted in line with exceptions under other policies, which this scheme does not meet. As the scheme is located outside of the limits of development where development would not be supported, substantial weight is now to be attributed to Core Policies 1, 2 and 23 of the WCS (2015) and on this basis the development is considered contrary to the delivery strategy and the application rejected in terms of the principle of development.

Core Policy CP57 of the adopted WCS states that *"A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality. Proposals should seek to enhance local distinctiveness and have regard to existing townscapes, patterns of development and the historic environment and landscape setting."*

Core Policy CP51 of the WCS states that *"Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and must not have a harmful impact upon landscape character, while any negative impacts must be mitigated as far as possible through sensitive design and landscape measures."*

The development proposal would see the erection of a dwellinghouse within the plot of land following the removal of the two unauthorised existing stable blocks. As identified within this report, the siting and overall design of the new dwellinghouse would fail to respect the prevailing character and form of the area and; given the proximity of the new dwellinghouse would result in an unneighbourly relationship to the neighbouring property, Wellmead Barn in regard to overlooking/amenity impacts. Thus, the scheme would be in conflict with Core Policies CP57 of the adopted WCS which requires new development to *"draw on the local context and to complement the locality and have regard to existing townscapes and patterns*

of development", Core Policy CP51 that states "*development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character*" and saved policy C6 of the Salisbury District Local Plan that requires development proposals to be sympathetic and appropriate to the landscape, having regard to scale, siting, landscaping and design.

Core Policies 60 and 61 of the adopted WCS requires new development to be located and designed to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car, and to encourage the use of sustainable transport alternatives. The site is located within the open countryside with limited access to local facilities, services or employment opportunities. On balance it is considered that future occupiers of the dwelling would be heavily reliant on the private motor vehicle for day to day access to essential services and employment opportunities and as such the proposed location is not considered to promote a sustainable pattern of development.

Benefits

The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and this deficit is a material planning consideration. In this case the proposed development would provide one new dwelling, which in housing supply terms, would make a nominal contribution towards addressing the shortfall, but it would nevertheless make a contribution which must be given some weight in the planning balance. There would also be some short-term benefits afforded to the construction phase of the development through direct and indirect job creation and the future householders of the properties would pay council tax. In addition, the development would contribute towards CIL infrastructure funding in the area. These benefits can cumulatively be given moderate weight in the planning balance.

Conclusion

Officers note the concerns received from the members of the public and the Parish Council to this proposal that have been carefully considered and are duly noted. Officers also note the call-in of this application by Cllr Cooper should officers be minded to grant planning permission.

The scheme is located outside of the limits of development and is not considered to be compliant with the 'infill' policy as outlined at paragraph 4.25 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS). On this basis the development is considered contrary to Core Policies 1, 2 and 23 of the adopted WCS. The location of the proposed dwelling would be located in an unsustainable location where future occupiers would be reliant on the private motor car to access essential services and employment opportunities contrary to Core Policies 60 and 61 of the adopted WCS. Furthermore, the proposed development would fail to respect the prevailing pattern of development, resulting in a detrimental impact upon visual amenity, and would be an unneighbourly form of development, contrary to Core Policies 51 and 57 of the adopted WCS and saved policy C6 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

On balance, the substantial conflict with the development policies would in this instance significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and accordingly, it is recommended that the application is refused.

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be refused for the following reason(s):

1. The application site lies outside of the limits of development in the open countryside where future occupiers would be reliant upon the private car. Under Core Policy 1

(Settlement Strategy), Core Policy 2 (Delivery Strategy), Core Policy 23 (Southern Wiltshire Community Area), Core Policy 60 (Sustainable Transport) and Core Policy 61 (Transport & Development) the development is not considered to be 'infill' development so does not comply with the Settlement and Delivery Strategies as a matter of principle. The Strategies are designed to ensure new developments satisfy the fundamental principles of sustainability, and so it follows that where a proposal such as this fails to comply with them then it will be unsustainable in this overarching context. The proposal would therefore cause unacceptable harm to the environmental and social objectives of the area and is, therefore, contrary to Core Policies 1, 2, 23, 60 and 61 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy and paragraphs 2, 7-15, 48 and 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2. The application site lies within the Special Landscape Area. Saved Policy C6 of the Salisbury District Local Plan and Core Policy 51 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy require development to protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character. The development proposal would see the erection of a dwellinghouse upon the rural parcel of land that by way of its design and siting fails to respect the prevailing character and form of the area, is not in keeping with the surrounding pattern of residential development and would result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity. As a consequence, the scheme would be contrary to Core Policy CP51 (Landscaping), saved policy C6 of the Salisbury District Local Plan, criteria i, ii, iii and vi of Core Policy CP57 (Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping) and the requirements of the NPPF.