

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by S Ramsden BSc (Hons) MA MA IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1715/W/25/3366368

Barn opposite Stroudwood Nursery, Stroudwood Lane, Upham SO32 1HG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Wyre against the decision of Eastleigh Borough Council.
 - The application reference is F/25/98967.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1 no. industrial storage building and associated yard (use class B8) following demolition of existing barn.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There is a dispute between the parties concerning the extent of the site for which Change of Use for B8 storage or distribution is permitted under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class R of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO). I have taken the extent to be that shown on drawing Ref. 101 approved under Prior Approval PN/24/98380 (dated 27 November 2024), which corresponds with the definition of curtilage for the purpose of Class R set out in the GPDO. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the countryside.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Stroudwood Lane, which is a narrow road bounded by hedgerows and tree lined fields. It contains a large open-sided barn, surrounded by informal hardstanding and rough grassland, and has an agricultural character and appearance. The site is bounded by hedges to the road and south side and by a low earth bund to the north, with the rear of the site being more open to the fields beyond. I observed at my site visit that the barn and site were used for storage of hay bales and equipment associated with agricultural activities.
5. The surrounding area is unmistakably rural with an open landscape character which is lightly settled and mainly agricultural in nature, with pockets of horticultural, equestrian, and residential uses. Fields in the area are typically enclosed by low hedges or low open, stock fencing and gates.
6. The proposal is to replace the existing barn with a solid-sided building on the same footprint and to the same ridge height, but with an increase in eaves height from

approximately 3m to 5m. There would be a tarmac parking/yard area to the front of the building, and a further storage area with a permeable surface to the north. A palisade security fence is proposed around the site.

7. The proposed building would have a larger volume than the existing barn and, being fully enclosed would be a more visually solid structure. The increase in visual bulk of the building would be exacerbated by the dark cladding. The glazed entrance screen to the corner would contribute further to its industrial appearance, harming the character of the countryside.
8. Full details have not been provided of the proposed palisade fencing, around the perimeter of the site, or the entrance gates; however, to provide security they would undoubtedly be of a different height, appearance, and character to those of the surrounding field and site boundaries. This would add to the industrial and urbanising character of the development, and cause harm to the open nature and appearance of the countryside.
9. The extent and nature of the tarmac parking/yard surface and storage area, to the north of the building, would contrast markedly with those of the surrounding fields and existing pockets of development in the vicinity. In comparison to the permitted B8 use, the large additional storage area to the north would more than double the storage area on the site, resulting in both a change in character of the site and an increase in intensity of that use. This would harm the character and appearance of the countryside.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the countryside. It would conflict with Policies DM1 and DM18 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), 2022, which seek to ensure that development does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the countryside.

Other Matters

11. No objections were received, and no third party representations were made, in response to the application. However, these are not factors which weigh in favour of allowing the appeal and do not diminish the harm that I have found on the main issue.
12. It is acknowledged that the proposed storage and distribution building and yard would employ around five people, make use of some previously developed land and provide for biodiversity net gain, general support for which is found in the National Planning Policy Framework. However, these benefits, even when taken cumulatively would be small in extent and would be outweighed by the harm the development would have on the character and appearance of the countryside.
13. The appellant has suggested that it would be unreasonable for the Council to refuse a planning application for over-cladding of the existing open-sided barn on the site and that, in conjunction with the permitted development right for the change of use to B8 storage and distribution, this should be regarded as a fallback position. Little firm evidence has been presented to support this assertion, and no planning permission is in place for such a fallback. In any event, unlike the proposal before me, such a fallback would not include a larger building, a significant increase in the area of the site for B8 use, or palisade security fencing around the site. Therefore, I find the suggested fallback position would be

preferable to the appeal scheme. It follows that it would not weigh in favour of allowing a more harmful proposal.

14. The appellant has suggested that conditions could be imposed to limit the height of materials to be stored outdoors on the site and increase planting. Whilst such measures may help reduce the extent of visual impact, they would not fully overcome my concerns about the harm caused by the proposal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Ramsden

INSPECTOR