

ITEM 8

APPLICATION NO.	18/00940/FULLN
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
REGISTERED	26.04.2018
APPLICANT	Aster Group
SITE	Garages at Venice Court, Andover, Hampshire, ANDOVER TOWN (ALAMEIN) / SMANNELL
PROPOSAL	Erection of 4 dwellings and associated works
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Mrs Mary Goodwin

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is presented to committee in accordance with the member and officer code of conduct.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site comprises a shared garage block, parking area and landscaped amenity space, at Venice Court, within a large residential development to the west of Icknield Way, in Andover. The development comprises clusters of terraced houses, arranged around cul de sacs, walkways and pockets of amenity landscaping. Within the site is the existing parking court (providing approximately 8 car spaces) forward of a low linear block of 11 garages, with low pitched roof. A landscaped amenity space wraps around the garage court to the north, east and south. This area is at a higher level and is contoured and planted with semi-mature trees and grass. There is a large electricity sub-station within a fenced compound to the south of the site adjoining the access. A low retaining wall wraps around the garage block to the north, south and east between the building and the amenity space.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing garages and the erection of 4 semi-detached three bedroom dwellings with off road parking for ten cars to the frontage to the west and enclosed private rear gardens to the east, towards Icknield Way. A narrow landscaped strip would be retained between the development and the highway to the east. The application is supported by a Tree Survey and a Parking and Transport report (which includes a local parking survey). The proposed dwellings have pitched roofs with dormer windows to the rear. A number of semi-mature trees are to be removed from the existing parking area and from the landscaped amenity space to accommodate the revised access, parking and new buildings.

4.0 **HISTORY**

- 4.1 TVN.6210 – Provision of 15 parking spaces at Florence Court, 17 parking spaces at Genoa court, 1 parking space at Turin Court, 1 parking space and 26 garages at Venice Court, on Roman Way Andover - Development under Town and Country Planning General Development Order, Regulation 4(5) – 06.01.1992, subject to planning conditions.

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

- 5.1 **Highway Engineer** – No objection, subject to conditions.
Applicant has satisfactorily justified the use of the existing garages and accounted for the net loss of parking spaces that would result from the development of the parking court. The proposed parking provision is acceptable and in accordance with the Council's RLP parking standards (Policy T2). The access (including visibility requirements) and manoeuvring arrangements is acceptable (Policy T1).
- 5.2 **Tree Officer** – Objection:
TPO.TVBC.1153 has been served on the trees behind the site to protect them.
- 5.3 The proposed development to build four houses on the site with the rear gardens backing on the land where the trees stand, will by the nature of proximity, dominance, falling debris, lack of useable garden space, blocked light and perceived threat, put future pressure on these important trees.
- 5.4 The trees are at an elevated location to the proposed houses and gardens and have the capacity to greatly increase in size. Making the situation worse and increasing the pressure on the trees future to be felled or pruned.
- 5.5 Future growth and light issues (including garden space) need to be taken into account at the design stage, allowing for the trees to reach their full potential.
- 5.6 Further concern is raised from the removal of available parking and the pressure this may have on grassed and treed areas close by as residents need to find new areas to park their vehicles.
- 5.7 The sectional drawing appears to be incorrect, further clarification is needed as to current land levels and proposed.
- 5.8 **Landscape Officer** – Objection:
Venice Court is part of the Roman Way development and consists of a mixture of dwellings from three storey terraced houses to detached bungalows all in close proximity to one another. Although there is a variety in size and scale of properties, there is a uniform character to the development. The high density clusters of development which form Roman Way are surrounded and enclosed by clusters of small and medium trees which aid to soften the development and form an integral part of the character. The rear of the garage block can be seen clearly from Icknield road and the site has no landscape designations.
- 5.9 There are a number of mature trees surrounding the development site which form an important part of the local and wider character; it is essential that these trees should be protected and retained.

- 5.10 Within the Site Plan there are a number of trees shown to be removed which have no bearing on the development, removing these trees will have a detrimental impact upon the local character and street scene, and will leave the site looking harsh and exposed as there will be little to soften the new development and integrate them with the existing properties surrounding the site.
- 5.11 The canopy of the large tree in the rear garden of plot 2 would fill the garden leaving 1m between the tree and the house. This will put significant pressure on the tree to be removed as it will leave the property with very little light. Likewise with Plot 4 there is 2m between the canopy of the tree and rear of the property. A shade diagram is required to demonstrate the level of light available for the rear gardens and ensure that there is no further need to fell more trees.
- 5.12 There is confusion between the existing and proposed levels. There is currently a retaining wall behind the garages, but the Section A-A Plan fails to address this level. It should also be noted that by excavating the land for the new gardens will potentially impact and damage the tree roots of the remaining trees.
- 5.13 Should the application be granted a landscape strategy for hard and soft landscaping will need to be submitted, this should include soft landscaping for the frontage of the new dwellings and hard landscaping demonstrating how the development will integrate within the local landscape. A landscape management plan will also be required to ensure the successful establishment of any new soft landscaping.
- 5.14 **Environmental Protection** – No objection, subject to conditions.
We note that the applicant is not intending to have any plant, ventilation or air conditioning as part of the application. Condition recommended to address possible land contamination and to require that a Phase 1 Assessment (i.e. Desk Study and QRA) is undertaken and a copy of the report submitted to the LPA for approval. Any contamination should thereafter be remediated and a scheme submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval and implementation. Demolition works should be restricted to no wider than 0730 and 1800 hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 and 1300 hrs on Saturdays, with no work on Sundays or Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed with the LPA. Best practicable means should be used to prevent dust emissions from all demolition and construction activities (e.g. the use of water to suppress dust) and bonfires should be prohibited to prevent causing a nuisance to people living and working in the vicinity of the site. There is an electricity substation adjoining the site. If not suitably maintained, this has the potential to cause noise issues from normal operation. We would recommend that the applicant engages with the operators of the substation and informs them that the site could change, so that they have the opportunity to ensure that stable acoustic controls are in place.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 30.05.2018

6.1 **Andover Town Council – Objection:**

- Parking is extremely difficult in this area and the proposal removes 19 parking spaces.
- Concern that emergency vehicle access would be difficult.
- The removal of parking spaces, as proposed, will lessen access further it is will force more cars to park in on the road.

6.2 **10 letters and emails of Objection (20, 41, 48, 58, 59, 61, 62, 70, 71 Venice Court, Andover; 1 address unknown)**

6.3 Highway/Parking/access issues:

- The loss of parking and garages (8 spaces and 11 garages) here will cause further parking problems in the area, where there is already insufficient parking. Additional parking on the roads and verges in the area blocks access and makes it difficult for emergency and service vehicles to gain access. People already double park in the area and parking obstructs routes for pedestrians, those with disabilities, children and cars;
- The 10 cars that currently parking here will need to fit into the 5 spaces outside my home (58 Venice Court) and cars already park on the verges and entrance to Venice Court;
- Bays should be retained for use by the local residents;
- The roads are becoming more and more dangerous due the level of on street parking for the houses on Augusta Park and Roman Way. The development would have a harmful impact on wider road and pedestrian safety;
- An application for flats on the concrete parking area adjacent to 1 Venice Court was refused in 2004 (TVN.06210/1) and it was noted then that the level of existing off street parking for Venice Court was below the adopted parking standard. The loss of off street parking will increase on street parking, to the detriment of the safety and free flow of traffic on the highway network, restricting access for emergency vehicles;
- The parking survey does not appear to take account of parking at peak times (around 7pm);

6.4 Impact on character of area and landscape/trees

- Overdevelopment of site and impact on the character of the area;
- The development would be visible from the road and would have a detrimental impact on the leafy character of the area;
- The trees in the gardens could be removed by the future occupants;
- The existing trees and landscaping are important to the area and wildlife. They soften the impact of the electricity substation. As few trees as possible should be felled;
- The loss of the trees and landscaping will be harmful and will be damaging to the natural environment, contrary to local plan policy;

6.5 Neighbour amenity

- The houses are over two storeys high and would block out light to homes (71 Venice Court) and causing overlooking;
- The development is opposite our home (70 Venice Court) and will harmfully impact on our privacy and levels of natural daylight;

6.6 Other matters

- Additional houses are unnecessary here;
- Applicant has not involved residents or the existing garage tenants or consulted them;
- Site Notice was on a tree near electricity substation and not in the garage court.

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)

- SD1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- COM2: Settlement hierarchy
- E1: High quality development in the Borough
- E2: Protect, conserve and enhance landscape character of the Borough
- Policy E5: Biodiversity
- Policy E7: Water Management
- LHW4: Amenity
- Policy T1: Managing Movement
- Policy T2: Parking Standards

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Andover Town Design Statement

Andover Town Access Plan

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development
- Visual amenity and impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Trees
- Highways
- Water Management
- Residential amenity
- Land Contamination

8.2 **The principle of development**

The site falls within the settlement boundary for Andover, as defined within the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) (or RLP). Policy COM2 of the RLP permits development and redevelopment within the defined boundaries of the settlements. The principle of new residential development is therefore acceptable.

8.3 Visual amenity and impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policy E1 of the RLP permits development if it is of a high quality in terms of design. To achieve this, development should integrate, respect and complement the character of the area in which the development is located in terms of appearance, scale, materials and building styles. Policy E2 requires development to protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the Borough. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that planning permission should be refused for development that is of poor design, and which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

8.4 The site comprises an existing shared parking court and low linear block of 11 garages adjoining a mature landscaped amenity space, between the residential development at Venice Court and the later Augusta Park residential development to the east of Icknield Way. The contoured amenity spaces and trees on and adjoining this site (and adjoining the surrounding developments) are a significant feature of the wider area, contributing to the character of the Icknield Way corridor and landscape and providing a green buffer between the housing and road. The trees within and around the development also give the Venice Court area an attractive and leafy character. The amenity planting helps to screens views of the electricity substation compound, parking and garage block. The levels vary across the site and there is a retaining wall wrapping around the existing garage block to the sides and rear, with land rising towards the north and west. Due to the low form of the existing buildings, the ground and building levels and their relationship to the adjacent trees, the existing garage block appears low and subservient within the street scene and landscape. The adjoining Venice Court residential development comprises a mix of single storey, two storey and three storey houses and flats, constructed in buff brickwork with pitched tiled roofs. There is a row of young trees towards the western boundary of the site (these trees are not covered by the TPO).

8.5 The proposed development of two pairs of 2½ storey semi-detached houses, fronting onto the former parking court, would be a prominent addition at this location. The dwellings would front onto the existing parking court to the west, which would have to be revised. The existing trees here would be removed to provide vehicular access to the frontage of the scheme. The proposed 2½ storey buildings would have a tall and bulky mass and appearance which would be appear out of character within the group (adjacent to the existing single storey dwellings to the north west and west, at 67 and 68 Venice Court). The Council's Landscape Officer has raised objection to the proposal and notes that the proposed layout and design would leave the area with a harsh and hard appearance, particularly due to the loss of the trees and landscaping. The existing electricity substation would appear a more dominant feature, due to the proposed removal of 6 of the trees that surround it, at the entrance to the parking court. The parking and manoeuvring space would dominate the frontage area, with little or no space for any meaningful soft landscaping.

- 8.6 Towards Icknield Way to the east, the development would extend into the existing landscaped amenity space within the site. The submitted plans show that most of this land is to be enclosed within private rear gardens serving the new dwellings, leaving a narrow strip of planting between the private gardens and highway. The application is unclear about the treatment of levels in this area and this is a significant concern, as the trees marked for retention on the submitted plans sit on the higher land, to the rear of the garages (most of which are covered by a Tree Preservation Order). The views from Icknield Way towards the site would be dominated by the new dwellings and their private enclosed gardens and fences. The submitted section (DWG 20) indicates that land levels would be dug down to achieve level gardens, with a 1.8m high boundary fence sited approximately 2m from the highway. However, these levels would not be achievable if the trees marked for retention are to remain on the higher land (as shown on proposed site plan 001-A). The section and layout plans therefore appear inconsistent in this regard. The agent has been informed of this and any further amended plans will be referred to in the Update Paper.
- 8.7 In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed 2½ storey dwellings with associated parking areas, gardens and boundary fences, combined with the loss of the existing trees and amenity spaces (which constitute a local landscape feature), would appear unduly dominant and harsh within the street scene and that the development would not therefore complement or integrate successfully within the local context, street scene, character and landscape, contrary to the provisions of RLP policies E1 and E2.
- 8.8 **Trees**
RLP policy E2 states that development will be permitted where the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape of the Borough can be ensured, subject to six pertinent criteria, a) to f). Criterion b) states that development will be '*designed and located to ensure that the health and future retention of important landscape features is not likely to be prejudiced*'. Criterion d) requires that '*arrangements for the long term management and maintenance of any existing and proposed landscaping*' have been made and criterion f) states that development will '*not result in the loss of important local features such as trees, walls, hedges or water courses*'.
- 8.9 The site contains a number of semi-mature trees within its boundaries, and some of these are protected by a recently served Tree Preservation Order (TPO.TVBC.1153). The existing trees on the site are an important local feature which make a positive contribution to the local landscape, providing a buffer between the development and enhancing the quality of the amenity space and living environment for local residents.
- 8.10 The proposed development of four houses with rear gardens backing onto the landscaped amenity land, where many of the trees stand, would by virtue of its proximity put significant future pressure upon the locally important trees that are marked for retention on the submitted plans. The Council's Tree Officer has raised objection to the application for this reason. The trees would dominate the proposed rear gardens and would lead to pressure to fell or

prune the trees, due to falling debris, lack of useable garden space and shading, particularly as the trees are likely to significantly increase in size during their lifetime. The trees are at an elevated position adjoining the development, and the submitted tree plan shows indicative shadow patterns (ref: BDS-09-17) which dominate the rear garden areas. The submitted sectional drawing showing existing and proposed levels and this appears to cast considerable doubt on the potential to retain the trees within the site, given the existing site levels. The development would therefore not integrate successfully within its landscape setting and would be likely to result in the pruning or the loss of important trees. For these reasons, the proposed development is considered to conflict with the provisions of criteria b), d) and f) to RLP Policy E2.

8.11 **Highways**

Policy T1 permits development where it does not have an adverse impact on the function, safety and character of, and accessibility to, the local or strategic highway network and rights of way network. Policy T2 requires development to provide parking in accordance with the standards set out in Annex G.

8.12 The proposed development would be served by the existing access to the parking court and the application includes the provision of 10 car spaces in total (2 spaces per each new dwelling and 2 additional visitor spaces). The proposed development would therefore have sufficient on site parking, to meet adopted parking standards, for the proposed four 3-bed dwellings (8 spaces) with a further 2 spaces for local residents and visitors. However, the application proposes the removal of the existing parking court which has provided for the parking and storage needs of the occupants of some of the nearby homes in the surrounding development (11 garages and 8 spaces). It is therefore appropriate to consider whether the displacement of the existing parking provision (to enable the redevelopment of the site) is acceptable against RLP policies T1, T2 and the Council's adopted parking standards (RLP Annexe G)

8.13 The site is located in an area where car ownership appears greater than the available off road parking, resulting in a high level of on-street parking within and around the development. A number of representations have been submitted to the Council raising objections to the proposal on highway safety grounds and raising concerns about the impact upon parking on streets within the area. There is a perception that parking is difficult within the area and that increased congestion would result in the immediate vicinity. Third parties are concerned that the loss of the existing garage court and parking will increase parking on roads and verges, which would reduce local highway safety for pedestrians and traffic, and restrict access for emergency and service vehicles.

8.14 In order to address the displacement of the existing parking and any associated impacts upon parking and highway safety in the area, the application is supported by a detailed Transport report and Parking Survey. The report confirms that the garages are rented to individuals from a wider area beyond Venice Court and it is evident that parking is not allocated to specific properties within the vicinity. The report states that two of the garages

are currently unlet and the majority of those rented are used for storage purposes rather than for the parking cars. It is noted that the internal dimension of the garages fall below adopted parking standards; they measure just 2.4m x 5m (rather than the specified minimum of 3m x 6m). The report also considers the viability of walking and cycling to key facilities, services and public transport connections in the vicinity and concludes that the site benefits from good access to facilities and services by non-car means (on foot, by cycle or by public transport) and this indicates a reduced need for local residents to travel by car.

- 8.15 The report includes a local parking survey, which assessed parking between 00.30 and 05.30 hours and between 11.00 and 14.00 hours on local roads. The survey considered the availability of parking bays and on-street parking during these times on 5th and 7th December 2017. The scope of the Transport report and the parameters for the Parking Survey were established following liaison with the Council's Highway Engineers, who agreed that a night time survey (between the hours of 00.30 - 05.30 hours) should be undertaken in addition to a day time survey. On-street parking spaces were specifically excluded from the survey where the running lane for passing vehicles would be below 3.7m wide. 98 parking bays or on street parking spaces were identified during the survey and these were found to be 87-88% occupied at night and 37-43% occupied during the day. The report concludes that there is sufficient parking on street and in parking bays to accommodate the parking that would be displaced by the proposed development and that the transport impacts associated with the application are therefore marginal.
- 8.16 In the light of the findings and conclusions of the submitted Parking and Transport report, the Council's Highway Engineer has raised no objection to the application, because the use of the existing garages has been justified and the net loss of parking spaces that would result from the redevelopment of the existing parking court has been accounted for. The proposed parking provision is therefore considered acceptable and in accordance with the Council's parking standards set out in RLP Policy T2 (and Annexe G). The proposed access and manoeuvring arrangements are also considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the provisions of RLP Policy T1.
- 8.17 **Water Management**
The RLP includes a requirement in policy E7 to achieve a water consumption standard of no more than 100 litres per person per day. This reflects the requirements of part G2 of the 2015 Building Regulations. This could satisfactorily be addressed by a planning condition in order to comply with the requirements of this policy.
- 8.18 **Residential amenity**
RLP Policy LHW4 permits development provided that the amenity of the occupants of any existing and/or proposed properties would not be harmed as a result of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing development. In addition, the occupants of the proposed new development should benefit from adequate levels of amenity and privacy.

- 8.19 The proposed dwellings would be sited approximately 14m to the south east of an existing single storey dwelling at 67 Venice Court and approximately 13m to the east of an existing single storey dwelling at 68 Venice Court. There are further dwellings sitting at least 16m to the south east (at 70-76 Venice Court) and on the opposite side of the existing parking court to the west, at a distance of at least 29m (58 to 60 Venice Court). Due to the offset alignment of the proposed dwellings in relation to the closest dwellings (67, 68, 71 and 72) it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant impact on these properties, or any other nearby properties, by virtue of any loss of light or privacy. It is also noted that there is an electricity substation at the entrance to the site within 6m of the closest new dwelling (unit 4). There is the potential for disturbance to the occupiers of the proposed new dwellings from the operation of the substation, unless the electricity substation is contained and maintained to avoid possible noise issues. The Environmental Protection Officer has advised that this is a matter that could be addressed by a planning condition or informative.
- 8.20 The proposed layout indicates that the four enclosed private rear gardens would adjoin the landscaped strip which wraps around the boundaries to the north, east and south. This strip contains semi-mature trees which are protected by a TPO and which are likely to grow significantly in future years. Some of the TPO trees lie within enclosed private garden areas. The garden areas vary in area, but are modest in depth and width (the rear boundary lies approximately 7m from the rear elevations). Notwithstanding the tree and ground issues set out at paragraphs 8.8 to 8.10, it is evident that the rear garden areas would lie almost entirely within the identified '*indicative shadow patterns for the main part of the day*', as marked on the submitted Tree Constraints Plan. The gardens would be heavily dominated by the adjacent trees and the shadow that would be cast by them. The amenity value of the gardens is therefore considered to be very limited, particularly in respect of plots 2, 3 and 4. For these reasons, it is considered that the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of RLP policy LHW4 criteria b) and c) in that it would not provide sufficient private open space appropriate for the needs of its residents and because levels of daylight and sunlight reaching the private open space serving the new dwellings would fall below acceptable levels, due to the relationship of the gardens and dwellings to the protected trees.
- 8.21 **Land Contamination**
The site has potential for contamination associated with its historic use. RLP policy E8 states that development will be permitted provided that it does not result in pollution which would cause unacceptable risk to human health, the natural environment or general amenity. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has advised that a land contamination assessment should be undertaken in order to establish the extent of any contamination. This assessment should then inform the development and may result in a requirement for further mitigation works. In the event that mitigation is necessary, a remediation scheme should be submitted for prior approval by the Local Planning Authority and implemented on site and this can be secured by a planning condition, in compliance with the provisions of RLP policy E8.

8.22 Other Matters

It is noted that the submitted cross section drawing (showing existing and proposed site and building levels) appears to conflict with the site survey and proposed drawings, and it is unclear how levels would be treated within and across the site, given the proposed retention of most of the trees which lie mainly on the higher ground (supported by retaining walls to the rear of the garage block). The section does not indicate any existing or proposed retaining walls or landscaped mounds and shows the proposed gardens cut into the slope. This matter could potentially be resolved through the submission of amended plans and further detailed cross-sections. The applicant has been advised of the requirement for more detailed levels information.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The application is considered to be acceptable, with regard to the impacts the proposed development would have upon parking levels and highway safety and water management. However, the layout, levels, design, appearance and siting of the proposed development fail to respect, integrate or complement the character and landscape of the local area and would not maintain a positive relationship between the private and public spaces within the site. It therefore fails to accord with criteria a), c) and d) to RLP policy E1. The proposal also fails to ensure the protection and enhancement of the landscape of the Borough, by virtue of the detrimental impact that the development is likely to have upon the existing trees within the site, in the short and longer term, including those that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The trees constitute an important local feature and their retention and health would be prejudiced by the proposed development, contrary to the provisions of criteria a), b), c), d) and f) of RLP policy E2. The application fails to provide adequate usable and private amenity space for the future residents of the three bedroom houses, as the enclosed private rear gardens would be dominated and heavily shaded by the TPO trees within the site, contrary to criteria b) and c) of RLP policy LHW4.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the reasons:

- 1. The application fails to demonstrate that the design, layout, scale, siting, levels and landscaping of the proposed development would integrate successfully within the local environment, or respond positively to the local character, street scene and landscape. The proposed development would have a harsh and hard appearance and would result in the loss of a significant area of shared landscaped space, which is important to the character, amenity and appearance of the existing development and area. The application therefore fails to accord with the provisions of Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policies E1 and E2.**
- 2. The proposal fails to provide for the retention of important existing trees within the site, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and which are considered to be important to the visual amenities and character of the area. The application fails to**

demonstrate how the trees could be retained and maintained during the construction period and into the future, given the proposed layout and levels, the positions of the trees within and adjoining the proposed private garden areas and dwellings and the anticipated future growth of the trees. The development is likely to result in conflict between the trees and living conditions within the dwellings and/or gardens, due to shading, maintenance issues, falling debris and overhanging branches resulting in predictable pressures to fell, lop or prune the trees. The proposal therefore fails to accord with criteria b), d) and f) to policy E2 of Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 3. The proposed layout and design fails to provide adequate usable private garden space for the amenities of the residents of the proposed three bedroom dwellings at plots 2, 3 and 4, as the enclosed rear gardens would be dominated and heavily shaded by the existing trees which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and which are proposed to be retained. The proposal therefore conflicts with criteria b) and c) to Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

Note to applicant:

- 1. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. TVBC work with applicants and their agents in a positive and proactive manner offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of issues that may arise in dealing with the application and where possible suggesting solutions.**
-