



Appeal Decision

Hearing held 5 April 2022

Site visit made on 3 November 2021

by M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/W/21/3273119

Land at Eversdown Farm Quarantine Kennels, 285 Botley Road, Burrridge SO31 1ZJ

- 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 Workham European Property Ltd against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/20/0506/OA, dated 4 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of agricultural buildings and erection of up to 38 dwellings with associated landscaping and access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of agricultural buildings and erection of up to 38 dwellings with associated landscaping and access at Land at Eversdown Farm Quarantine Kennels, Burrridge, SO31 1ZJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/20/0506/OA, dated 4 June 2020, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to an application for outline planning permission with all matters reserved. Illustrative plans have been provided indicating a potential layout for the development and single vehicular access point from Botley Road. At the Hearing, the appellant made clear that the plans submitted were for illustrative purposes only.
3. While I have treated these plans as illustrative, there is no clear alternative to the access proposals which, in turn, would likely result in a suburban cul-de-sac layout similar to that shown. I have, therefore, had regard to the principals of the likely site layout shown in the illustrative plans.
4. An amended plan was provided to the Council while the application was under consideration. The amendments related to the amount of affordable housing to be provided on the site. Consequential amendments were required to two other plans. These were submitted during the Hearing. The Council confirmed that it was content with the submission and, given the scope of the amendment and outline nature of the application, I am satisfied that no injustice would arise to any party if I were to consider them.

5. Due to a change in the appeal procedure, my site visit was carried out some time before the date of Decision. At the Hearing, the main parties confirmed that there had been no material change in circumstance and there was no need for me to revisit the site.
6. The Hearing was closed in writing on 19 May 2022.

Main Issue

7. The main issues are:

- (a) Whether the site is in an appropriate location for the development with regard to its relationship to existing settlements and accessibility;
- (b) The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
- (c) The effect on biodiversity interests on the site;
- (d) The effect on housing supply; and
- (e) The effect on European sites.

Reasons

Location

8. Policies CS2, CS6 and CS14 of the Fareham Local Development Framework: Core Strategy 2011, along with Policy DSP6 of the Fareham Borough Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies Plan (LP2) set out a strategy for housing delivery that favours development of various strategic sites and land within urban settlement boundaries, while setting a presumption against new residential development outside those areas. Development of the site, being outside a settlement boundary, is contrary to these policies.
9. However, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year deliverable supply of housing land. In this situation, LP2 Policy DSP40 specifically allows housing outside the urban area boundary, subject to compliance with various criteria. The second criterion is that the proposal should be sustainably located adjacent to, and well related to, the existing urban settlement boundaries, and well integrated with the neighbouring settlement.
10. The site does not adjoin the urban settlement boundary being, by the Council's calculation, around 200m from it. However, while differing in character to the housing within the settlement boundary, there is existing residential development between the site and the boundary so, in reality, it would not appear separate or detached from it.
11. The indicated vehicular access would be almost at the outer extent of this urban area. It is not clear whether any further pedestrian access, closer to the main areas of existing development, could be provided either practically, or with regard to potential effects on neighbours that may border any access route.
12. Development around Botley Road has a linear form, with limited connections into the built-up area that lies within the settlement boundary. Thus, the practical relationship of the immediately surrounding development to this wider, more extensive community is poor. The consequence is that walking distances to most existing services and facilities is lengthy. The notable

exception is the Burridge Village Hall and recreation ground, which adjoins the site.

13. A range of facilities, including primary and secondary schools and a local centre are being developed at nearby North Whiteley, within a neighbouring local planning authority area. Other than the, now open, primary school, it is not clear when these will be delivered. In any case, distances to them remain at the upper end of acceptable walking distances in some guidance documents and beyond them in others.
14. Even if places were available to residents of the appeal site, the current walking route to North Whiteley and the new Primary School is somewhat convoluted, requiring use of a range of footpaths with a rural character and urban estate roads that run somewhat awkwardly relative to the desire line. The walk from the site is possible, but I found it relatively unattractive for these reasons. Consequently, it is unlikely to be used on a regular basis by most people.
15. It appears that the North Whiteley development will secure bus services between the new facilities and the appeal site. This would significantly improve the accessibility to services and facilities. However, delivery is outside the control of the appellant and this local planning authority, and the timing is uncertain. I can, therefore, only attribute it limited weight.
16. With regard to the above, I conclude that the site is poorly located in respect of accessibility to services and facilities. It does not adjoin an urban settlement boundary, nor is it well related to it. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to LP2 Policy DSP40(ii).

Character and appearance

17. The land behind Eysersdown Farmhouse is occupied by a range of agricultural and dog kennel buildings. Beyond this, adjacent to the recreation ground, open fields and paddocks slope down towards the River Hamble. To the side, behind existing houses on Botley Road and Burridge Road, is an area generally enclosed by those houses and substantial tree planting that contains some further agricultural buildings.
18. The area closest to the recreation ground and sloping down towards the river has been identified as an Area of Special Landscape Quality (ASLQ). The designation does not cover the entire site, but the houses closest to the vehicular access would intrude into the ASLQ.
19. There would be some urbanisation of views from the recreation ground, where existing built form is not particularly present. However, while there would likely be some reduction in the tranquillity of the village hall and cricket ground, the effect would be reduced by the setting back of most development from the boundary such that the abundant mature trees would still likely dominate the view.
20. There are wide views across the river valley from the River Hamble Country Park. From here, the site itself is not readily visible and the substantial existing trees will ensure that the development does not diminish enjoyment of this apparently undeveloped area of countryside. Development beyond the limits of existing settlements would nearly always create some landscape impact and it may be difficult to accommodate more development on this site than has been

shown on the illustrative plans. Nevertheless, while less development could be sought, for the above reasons, I find this proposal to have been designed, and sited so as to minimise effects on the landscape.

21. The character of the adjoining residential area is linear ribbon development. Houses of various ages front Botley Road and Burridge Road in substantial, deep plots. The formation of a suburban cul-de-sac style development would be at odds with this established pattern. However, even if the settlement boundary has not been proposed for extension in this location, perhaps partly to protect the tranquil, semi-rural character of the area, this proposal would sit behind this ribbon development, largely buffered from the houses by their substantial gardens and boundary tree planting.
22. Away from the road frontage, the indicative plans suggest an access road with single sided development curving away from Botley Road, which would not necessarily appear as overly suburban. In any case, all matters are reserved for subsequent consideration. While the single point of access would limit layout options, there is no clear reason why alternative building forms or layout groups could not be deployed, if that were deemed necessary, to better integrate into the area.
23. In any event, the location of the site, established planting, and position of most development behind the neighbouring dwellings would not undermine the strong character and appearance of the existing, adjoining urban area. There would, therefore, be no conflict with those aspects of CS Policies CS14 and CS17 that seek to protect landscape character and appearance, and require development to respond positively and be respectful to key characteristics of the area.
24. I have found that the proposal does minimise any adverse effect on the countryside, as required by LP2 Policy DSP40 (iii). However, that policy also requires development to reflect the character of the neighbouring settlement. The likely resulting urban form does not reflect the established ribbon development, so there is some conflict with this policy aim.

On-site biodiversity

25. Reptiles are known to be present on the site. The appellant's mitigation strategy originally sought to move the reptile population to a temporary site while a permanent receptor site is made available. The Council were concerned that this would not be in the best interests of the reptile population. Revised evidence was provided with the appeal documents that would prioritise formation of the permanent receptor habitat such that the relocation could occur in one move. The Council confirmed at the Hearing that this approach would be acceptable.
26. Although it is possible that wildlife could be being gradually placed under pressure following displacement from the extensive development at North Whiteley, there is no substantive evidence that other species, or areas of ancient woodland at or adjoining the site, would be harmed by this development. Therefore, subject to a condition to secure a detailed ecological management plan, that would include a strategy for reptile relocation, I conclude that there would be no harm to biodiversity at the site. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with those aims of LP2 Policy DSP13 that seek to protect and mitigate biodiversity interests.

27. A lack of biodiversity net-gain (BNG) would not result in a clear conflict with LP2 Policy DSP13. However, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) does encourage such measures, as would an emerging local plan. It has not been clearly demonstrated that BNG would be achieved and, while some may be possible as part of an ecological management plan, the absence of clear proposals leads to some conflict with the aims of the Framework.

Housing supply

28. The proposal would provide a range of new homes, including affordable housing. It is common ground that, for the purposes of this appeal, there is 4.31 years supply of homes and in this context, I attribute substantial weight to the benefits associated with the provision of new homes, their construction and on-going occupation. The submitted unilateral undertaking would ensure that both market and affordable housing was provided.
29. I understand that the area is currently experiencing significant change, in particular the delivery of several thousand homes at North Whiteley. However, while I can understand that existing local residents may prefer to see that development substantially completed before proposals for more homes were considered, there remains an unmet housing need now.
30. While it may be preferable to resolve matters of housing shortfall via long-term plan-led solutions, development of this medium sized site would be relative in scale to the shortfall and there is no apparent reason that it should not be deliverable in the short term as required by LP2 Policy DSP40 (i) and (iv).

European sites

31. Residential development at the site could, in combination with other development, lead to adverse effects on the integrity of the Solent Coastal Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (the Solent Sites). Two broad pathways to likely effects have been identified – through increased disturbance from recreational use associated with additional residents, and through nutrient enrichment of the water environment. There is also potential for adverse effects to the integrity of the New Forest SAC through recreational pressure. I have, therefore, carried out an appropriate assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations) and my findings are recorded below.
32. The Solent Sites are protected for their internationally important wildlife. These include winter hosting of waders and wildfowl including 10 per cent of the global population of Brent geese. There are also plants, habitats and other animals of national and international importance.
33. The New Forest SAC is identified for various features including oligotrophic waters containing very few minerals, sandy plains, oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with associated vegetation, northern Atlantic wet heaths, European dry heaths, Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils, transition mires and quaking bogs, depressions on peat substrates, alkaline fens, and associated flora and fauna. The New Forest SPA is identified for its populations of European honey buzzard, Hen harrier, Eurasian Hobby, European nightjar, Woodlark, Dartford warbler, and Wood warbler.
34. The Council has explained how the effects of recreational pressure are capable of being mitigated through the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy and

interim mitigation solution for the New Forest SAC. The submitted planning obligation includes appropriate financial contributions to this based upon the number of dwellings proposed. Recreational effects would, therefore, be mitigated.

35. Natural England (NE) has provided guidance on how developments can achieve 'nutrient neutrality' so as to avoid additional nutrient loading. Under the guidance, off-site 'credits' can be purchased from land that has been taken out of agricultural use elsewhere in the river catchment to off-set the likely increase in nutrient discharge from a residential scheme.
36. Due to disagreement over how the existing land use should be assessed, the main parties have agreed two nutrient budgets. It was agreed at the Hearing that the only area of disagreement is whether a small part of the site should be considered to be in a poultry farming use, which would have caused higher nutrient discharge, result in a lower net increase in output from the residential use, and a need to purchase fewer off-site credits.
37. Poultry farming occurred at the site until 2014 since when the site has been used for storage and maintenance purposes in connection with a poultry business that houses livestock elsewhere. The current NE guidance does not set out a clear approach to assessing the existing land use. At the Hearing, though, the main parties both referred to previous guidance as a helpful guide to what was relevant when assessing the existing use.
38. The previous NE guidance was clear that a baseline minimal 'greenspace' value should apply to any land that has not been in agricultural use for the last 10 years. That does not necessarily mean that on other sites the highest nutrient output use over the last 10 years should be taken as the existing use. Rather, the previous guidance referred to the need for evidence of farm type for the last 10 years and professional judgement as to what the land would revert to in the absence of a planning application.
39. For the most recent 8 of the last 10 years, although it has been used in connection with an existing poultry business, the site has not been in active poultry farming. To some extent the likely future use is important, as the mitigation itself is intended to off-set future development. However, while I acknowledge that the landowners have stated an intention to return livestock to the land and may have chosen not to do so while investigating the site's development potential, the existing buildings are in visibly poor condition and, even if mobile housing could be used, it is not clear what would actually be required in order to re-stock the site. Therefore, I can attach only limited weight to the prospect that active poultry farming would return to the site in the near future.
40. That is not to say that a poultry use has somehow been abandoned, nor that there is no realistic prospect of its resumption. I also acknowledge that the landowner would be unlikely to leave the site unused if development could not proceed. However, while there has been active poultry farming at the site within the last 10 years, that is not, and has not been for some time, the current use of the land.
41. The NE guidance may well be infused with the precautionary principal, but that does not appear to be a good reason to take a more relaxed approach to some of the modelling inputs than others. Moreover, the previous version, from

which the parties seek guidance in this regard, explicitly said that it is important that the farm type classification is appropriately precautionary. Natural England have also advised me to ensure that the approach to purchasing credits is precautionary.

42. For these reasons, and in the absence of certainty over the return of poultry livestock to the site, I find that no part of the land should be classified as poultry farming for the purpose of establishing a nutrient budget for this development. It, therefore, follows that the higher of the two scenarios modelled by the main parties should apply and 57.19kg/TN/year worth of off-site credits are required to off-set the effect of the development.
43. The appellant has entered into an agreement to purchase sufficient credits at the Warnford Park Estate. This is covered by an overarching legal agreement between the Council, South Downs National Park Authority and landowner concerning the sale of credits and future land management responsibilities.
44. Evidence has been provided to indicate that there are sufficient credits available and the Council confirmed at the Hearing that the documentation is up-to-date, reflecting the current NE guidance. The Council is not party to the agreement to purchase credits and, therefore, there is a need for a further control mechanism to ensure that development cannot commence until the purchase has been confirmed. A Grampian condition, referring to the specific amount and location of credits, would provide sufficient certainty that the required mitigation would be in place. On this basis, I conclude that adverse effects on the Solent Sites would be avoided.
45. Therefore, following appropriate assessment, I am satisfied that the proposal, in combination with other development, will not lead to adverse effects on the integrity of any of the potentially affected European sites. As competent authority, I can agree to the proposal, and there will be no conflict with CS Policy CS4 or LP2 Policy DSP15 that seek to prevent adverse effects on the protected sites.

Other Matters

46. The proposal would result in additional traffic using the, already busy, Botley Road, exacerbated by the poor accessibility to services and facilities. I understand that there may have already been considerable increases in traffic from the North Whiteley development, which is not yet complete. However, whether or not local road closures may have affected the appellant's reported local traffic flows, the Local Highway Authority have raised no concerns about the effect on the operation of the highway network, or safety. There is no substantive evidence that there is inadequate physical and social infrastructure, including healthcare, broadband or sewerage provision, within the wider area to support the needs of future residents.
47. Dwellings on Botley Road and Burridge Road back onto the site. Rear windows face towards the site, separated from it by private rear gardens. Matters of scale and appearance are reserved for future consideration, and I have no reason to conclude that a suitable relationship could not be designed to ensure that the privacy of these neighbours was protected. While there may be some change to the outlook from these existing properties, due to the distances, that would not lead to demonstrably harmful living conditions.

48. I note suggestion that the proposal may encroach onto land outside the appellant's control. Whatever the case, this has little to do with the planning merits of the scheme.

Planning balance

49. The site is outside the defined urban settlement boundaries and conflicts with the spatial strategy set out in the development plan. In the absence of a 5 year supply of housing land, LP2 Policy DSP40 makes provision for housing outside the boundaries. This site is not adjoining the settlement boundary, has poor accessibility to services and facilities and the proposal is unlikely to reflect the surrounding pattern of development. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the aims of Policy DSP40 and the development plan, read as a whole.
50. However, the housing supply situation also means that Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) falls to be considered. My consideration of the main issues means that there are no policies of the Framework that provide a clear reason for refusing the proposal. Therefore, Paragraph 11(d)(ii) indicates that permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This is a materially different scenario to some earlier appeal Decisions at Sopwith Way¹, Old Street² and East of Posbrook Lane³ where, under a previous version of the Framework, this balance did not apply due to the need for an appropriate assessment, or effects on heritage assets.
51. While there would be conflict with the aims of LP Policy DSP40 in terms of its lack of reflection of local development pattern, there is no significant conflict with the aims of the Framework, read as a whole, in respect of the design and layout of the proposal. This is because I have found that the proposal would not actually harm the existing residential character of the area, nor the landscape and so would be sympathetic to local character, preserving local identity. Moreover, the Framework encourages efficient use of land which the suggested type of layout would achieve in a way that continuing the ribbon development prevalent in the area would fail to do, whilst also creating a more compact development that would encroach less into the countryside.
52. The accessibility shortcomings are notable. The Framework seeks to provide safe, inclusive and accessible places that promote health and well-being. It also explains that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to promote walking, cycling and public transport use. Significant development should be focussed where the need to travel can be limited and a genuine choice of transport modes is available. There is tension with these aims of the Framework.
53. Against that, is the clear objective within the Framework to boost significantly the supply of homes. There is a shortfall in supply and in this scenario, I have attributed substantial weight to the benefits associated with delivery. The development is of a medium scale and would be contiguous with a large existing urban area, if not the policy defined development boundary. In the context of the surrounding development, it would not result in a significant

¹ APP/A1720/W/18/3200928

² APP/A1720/W/18/3200409

³ APP/A1720/W/18/3199119

increase in local population with limited transport choices and the site is adjacent to the recreation ground and community hall.

54. Taking the policies of the Framework as a whole, I find that the shortcomings in accessibility and, with no demonstrable harm to biodiversity, the lack of clear BNG, do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The proposal, therefore, benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined at Framework paragraph 11. The Framework, as Government policy is a very weighty material consideration.
55. LP2 Policy DSP40 allows the release of additional land in a plan-led way when there is a lack of 5 year housing land supply. In this context, the conflicts with the broad settlement strategy set out elsewhere in the other policies are of limited weight. However, as it is specifically engaged in scenarios where there is unmet housing need, the conflict with Policy DSP40 carries substantial weight. This approach accords with a number of previous appeal decisions such as at a site east of Downend Road⁴, although, following application of paragraph 11(d), that proposal did not have support of the Framework, so the case overall is not comparable. The balance of considerations specific to each proposal must be weighed in the context of the particular circumstance of each appeal. In this regard, my findings could not necessarily be repeated elsewhere, including at other sites on this side of Botley Road that may not have, historically, been considered appropriate for development.
56. However, even with the enabling provisions of Policy DSP40, there remains an unmet housing need. In this case, given the nature of the harms identified I, therefore, find that the benefits associated with housing delivery, together with the support conferred by the Framework, indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan in this case.

Conditions

57. Conditions are required seeking approval of the reserved matters. The Council has suggested that application is made within six months of the date of the permission which gives little time for preparation of an appropriate scheme. While there could be theoretical benefits of reducing the time for submission in terms of early housing delivery, there is no substantive evidence justifying the time limit. Failure to achieve the deadline could lead to further delay. I have, therefore, imposed standard conditions in this regard. There is no need for a condition that development should be carried out in accordance with approved drawings as all matters are reserved.
58. A condition has been recommended that landscaping details should include details of how planting will be carried out on the southwest boundary. However, landscaping is a reserved matter and if such is required to make development acceptable, it can be dealt with at reserved matters stage. Even if it were enforceable in perpetuity, there is no obvious requirement for planting within the adjoining blue-edged land, or the southwest boundary that would warrant a specific parameter being established in that regard. I have not, therefore, imposed this condition. Conditions relating to the scale of development and access are similarly reserved matters and are not necessary.

⁴ APP/A1720/W/19/3230015

59. To safeguard on-site biodiversity, a mitigation strategy should be submitted for approval by the Council. In the interests of highway safety and to protect living conditions, a condition is necessary to secure a construction traffic management plan, and limit hours of working. To prevent any increase in off-site flood risk and ensure that surface water drainage is adequately dealt with, a condition is required to secure a detailed drainage scheme.
60. To promote travel by low-carbon means, details of electric vehicle charging are required. A condition is necessary to ensure that the mitigation credits for the Habitats sites are properly secured, along with another to secure a scheme to limit water consumption to that assumed in the nutrient modelling.
61. There is no need for detailed lists of matters to be included in the conditions in order to make them precise or enforceable. My conditions allow the parties to agree the content of the required schemes at the appropriate time of submission of details, based upon prevailing guidance and requirements then. I have made other minor revisions to the Council's suggested conditions in the interests of consistency and to ensure compliance with the Framework.

Conclusion

62. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR

Schedule

- 1) Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) No development shall commence until the Notice of Purchase in accordance with the legal agreement between Fareham Borough Council, the South Downs National Park Authority and Andrew Sellick dated 1 April 2021 in respect of the Credits Linked Land identified in the Nitrates Mitigation Proposals Pack to secure 57.19kg/TN/year has been submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 5) No development shall commence until a scheme for the protection of biodiversity interests on the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timings therein and shall thereafter be maintained as specified within the approved scheme.
- 6) No development shall commence on site until a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority).
- 7) No development hereby permitted shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme including a timetable for its delivery and scheme for future maintenance for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Prior to the occupation of the development, details of water efficiency measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These water efficiency measures shall be designed to ensure potable water consumption does not exceed an average of 110 litres per person per day. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter maintained as such.
- 9) Prior to the occupation of the development, details of how electric vehicle (EV) charging points shall be provided shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented such that the EV charging points shall be installed prior to the occupation of the dwellings to which they relate and shall thereafter be maintained as such.
- 10) No work relating to the construction of any development hereby permitted (including works of demolition or preparation prior to operations) shall take place before 08:00 or after 18:00 Monday to Friday, before 08:00 or after 13:00 on Saturdays or at all on Sundays or recognised public holidays, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

End of conditions

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Wayne Beglan – Counsel
Ian Johnson BSc (Hons) MA PG UD MRTPI
Steven Scates Solicitor
David West CEnv MCIEEM

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Richard Wright MRTPI

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Agreement between James Andrew Sellick and Workham European Property Ltd relating to Nitrate mitigation at the Warnford Park Estate, dated 4 April 2022.
2. Drawing 18.041-A-200 Rev P2 (Proposed Masterplan in Context)
3. Drawing 18.041-A-201 Rev P2 (Proposed Masterplan)
4. Drawing 18.041-A-202 Rev P2 (Colour Masterplan)
5. Letter dated 4 April 2022 and 6 appendices to Richard Wright, from Peter Walker (Wilson Wraight) re. Confirmation of Exchange – Andrew Sellick – Workham European Property Limited
6. Statement of Common Ground 2 – Final dated 8 April 2022
7. Fareham Borough Council, Executive Briefing Paper: Implications of Natural England advice on New Forest Recreational Disturbance dated 7 December 2021
8. European Site Conservation Objectives for The New Forest Special Area of Conservation
9. European Site Conservation Objectives for New Forest Special Protection Area
10. Unilateral Undertaking: Vero Poultry Ltd and Pamela Ann Wellstead and Colin Wellstead to Fareham Borough Council dated 16 May 2022.