

ITEM 7

APPLICATION NO.	15/02936/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	03.12.2015
APPLICANT	That Way Ltd
SITE	Poplar Farm, Dean Road, West Tytherley, SP5 1NR, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing redundant commercial buildings and the erection of two new barn-style dwellings, and associated works
AMENDMENTS	20 April 2016, 6 May 2016, 11 August 2016
CASE OFFICER	Rachel Illsley / Jason Owen

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is presented to the Planning Control Committee (PCC) following a resolution made by the Southern Area Planning Committee (SAPC) on the 13 December 2016 to refuse planning permission for the scheme. This resolution is contrary to the recommendation of officers and would, in the opinion of the Head of Planning and Building, leave the Council at risk of an award of costs in the event of an appeal being lodged against such a refusal of permission.
- 1.2 The officer's report and corresponding update paper for the 13 December 2016 SAPC meeting are appended to this report as Appendices A and B.

2.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 2.1 SAPC resolved to refuse the application for two reasons for refusal. The referral to PCC by the Head of Planning and Building was made on the basis of the first reason for refusal with respect to the development's impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The second reason for refusal simply arises as a consequence that the required legal agreement had not, at the time, been signed. There is no suggestion that the applicant isn't prepared to sign such an agreement and so this matter would, in the event that the proposal were to be considered acceptable, be satisfactorily addressed.
- 2.2 Members at SAPC considered that the overall design and proportions of the two units were unacceptable. There were specific points identified that were considered inappropriate.
- (i) Roof pitch
 - (ii) Roof material
 - (iii) Proportions

2.3 Roof pitch

Comments at SAPC in respect of roof form and pitch were made with respect to the apparent low profile of the resultant buildings. Concern that such a low profile (and the use of slate on Barn 2) would emphasise how ‘squat’, or ‘compressed’ the dwellings would appear in the street scene. Both buildings utilise half-hipped (or barn-hipped) forms to achieve the required span and, as can be seen from the elevation drawings, a lowering of the overall height of Barn 2 from that which was originally submitted. This roof design is considered consistent with the existing buildings on the Poplar Farm complex and would ensure the overall rural character and appearance would be preserved. It is also considered that public view points of the proposal from Dean Road are such that this would limit the extent to which the side-profiles of these buildings would be appreciated.

2.4 Roof material

Barn 1 - Clay plain tiles

It is clear from the photographs that plain clay tiles are used extensively on the buildings that form the Poplar Farm complex. In this respect their use on Barn 1, when seen in the context of other, retained buildings nearby, is considered appropriate and consistent with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The 1991 West Tytherley Conservation Area Policy document identifies the use of such material within the settlement. Its intended use on this new building is considered to accord with the requirement to “using local or traditional materials, colours and detailing” (Planning Policies and Controls, Section 3. Page 9) of this document.

Barn 2 – natural slate

The introduction of natural slate as a roofing material onto this site would represent a change to that which currently exists on the main buildings. That said, natural slate is not an uncommon material used on roofs within the rural areas of Test Valley, and there is evidence of a dark, slim-profiled slate roof on a small lean-to extension on the roadside adjacent to the site (outbuilding serving Heatherdean). Indeed the 1991 West Tytherley Conservation Area Policy document identifies the use of plain clay tiles or Welsh slate as possible replacements to the traditional, locally available, material for roofs (long straw thatch) (The character of the village, Pg4) suggesting that slate does exist, and/or is an appropriate replacement material to be used. A further reference in the 1991 West Tytherley Conservation Area Policy, albeit in the context of repairs or alterations to Listed buildings, advises that “...*Avoid replacement with non-traditional materials such as uPVC or aluminium windows, concrete tiles, artificial slates [my emphasis] or plastic gutters*” (Planning Policies and Control section, Section 2, 2nd bullet point, page 8). Reference in this respect to artificial slates being inappropriate would suggest that natural slate would be acceptable. The use of natural slate on the roof of Barn 2 is considered appropriate, and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

2.5 Proportions of the dwellings

Discussions at SAPC also intimated that the buildings were also too large and that in combination with those matters referred to above, resulted in harm to the Conservation Area. Comparing the footprint of the proposed dwellings with the footprint of the existing buildings (refer to “Proposed site plan”) it is clear that they are very similar in size. It is acknowledged that the new buildings are not sited exactly on the same position as the existing buildings however it is considered that (i) having regard to the extent of public vantage points to the buildings and (ii) there is very little visual difference between the existing and proposed buildings, that the proposal would not result in such a substantial change in appreciation of built development on site, that the proposal would be harmful to the interests of the Conservation Area.

2.6 The design basis of the dwellings has, according to the applicant, never been one that sought to replicate an agricultural barn. There are design references to the form and appearance of the existing buildings and the proposed siting broadly recreates the yard arrangement that exists. However the dwellings being developed are residential in character and, as described above, use materials, roof forms and shapes that are consistent with the overall rural character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is considered acceptable.

3.0 **CONCLUSION**

3.1 Notwithstanding the SAPC expressing concerns over the detailed design of the proposed two dwellings and the effect the resultant scheme would have on the rural character and setting of this part of the Conservation Area when viewed from Dean Road, in light of the above, officers remain of the opinion that given the limited visibility of the dwellings from the road – assisted by the limited extent of views and the presence of other, retained buildings, and, indeed the appropriately detailed and scale of buildings it is considered the proposal would successfully integrate into the area, thereby preserving the special rural character and appearance of the Conservation Area in compliance with relevant policies of the Borough Local Plan 2016.

4.0 **RECOMMENDATION of the SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
REFUSE for the reasons:**

1. **The proposal, by virtue of the design (including roof pitch and choice of roof materials) and the proportions of the two proposed dwellings, when viewed from Dean Road immediately adjacent to the site entrance, would result in an inappropriate form of development in this location. The proposal would introduce an unsympathetic form of development, unconvincing as replacement farm buildings, adversely affecting the rural character and setting of this part of the West Tytherley Conservation Area. The proposal therefore fails to make a positive contribution to either sustaining or enhancing the significance of the setting and character of the Conservation Area contrary to Policies E1(a) and E9(a) of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

2. **The site lies within close proximity to the New Forest SPA which is designated for its conservation importance. In the absence of a legal agreement, the application has failed to secure the required mitigation measures, in accordance with the Council's adopted 'New Forest SPA Mitigation - Interim Framework'. As such, it is not possible to conclude that the development would not have an in-combination likely significant effect on the interest features of these designated sites, as a result of increased recreational pressure. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the Council's adopted 'New Forest SPA Mitigation - Interim Framework', Policy E5 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).**

5.0 **RECOMMENDATION of the HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building for the completion of a legal agreement to secure the following:**

- **Financial contribution towards the 'New Forest SPA Mitigation – Interim Framework' for off-site mitigation measures**

Then PERMISSION subject to:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**
2. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans:
Site Location Plan – drawing 1700/P01 Rev A
Existing Site & Roof Plan – drawing 1700/P02
Proposed Site Plan – drawing 1700/P03 Rev A
Proposed Site Sections AA, BB, CC – drawing 1700/P04 Rev B
Proposed Barn 1 Floor Plans – drawing 1700/P05 Rev D
Proposed Barn 1 Elevations – drawing 1700/P06 Rev D
Proposed Barn 2 Floor Plans – drawing 1700/P07 Rev D
Proposed Barn 2 Elevations – drawing 1700/P08 Rev D
Proposed Barns 1 & 2 Roof Plans – drawing 1700/P09
Proposed Bin & Bike Stores – drawing 1700/P10
Existing Plans: Building A – drawing 1700/S01
Existing Elevations: Building A – drawing 1700/S02
Existing Plans: Building B – drawing 1700/S03
Existing Elevations: Building B – drawing 1700/S04
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
3. **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the measures set out in Section 5.5, 'Bat Mitigation Plan' of the Bat Survey Report – Updated Phase 2 Report, (Winchester Bat Consultancy, 2015), unless varied by a European Protected Species (EPS) licence subsequently issued by Natural England. Thereafter, the replacement bat roosts shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: to ensure the favourable conservation status of bats in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 4. The development hereby approved shall be designed and built to meet Regulation 36 2 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015.
Reason: In the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 5. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Implementation shall be in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 6. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use or occupied until the approved parking provision has been laid out and provided for use in accordance with the approved plan and this space(s) shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy T2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 7. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details, including plans and cross sections, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the height of the ground floor slab of the new building. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure satisfactory relationship between the new development and the adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees in accordance with Policies LHW4 and E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 8. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted full details of hard and soft landscape works including planting plans; written specifications (stating cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities and an implementation programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall also include; proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure and hard surfacing materials (where appropriate). The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme.
Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

9. **The first floor window in the western elevation of Barn 2 shall be obscure glazed and non-opening and shall be retained in this condition.**
Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the neighbouring property in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
10. **Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details of the proposed surface water and foul drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Implementation shall be in accordance with the approved details.**
Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage provision on the site, in accordance with Policy COM15 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.**
-

APPENDIX A

Officer Report to Southern Area Planning Committee on 13 December 2016

APPLICATION NO.	15/02936/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	03.12.2015
APPLICANT	That Way Ltd
SITE	Poplar Farm, Dean Road, West Tytherley, SP5 1NR, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
PROPOSAL	Demolition of existing redundant commercial buildings and the erection of two new barn-style dwellings, and associated works
AMENDMENTS	20 April 2016, 6 May 2016, 11 August 2016
CASE OFFICER	Rachel Illsley
	Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application was presented to Members in April 2016, with a recommendation of approval. Members resolved to defer the application on the following grounds:

‘DEFER to enable the submission and consideration of viability information relating to the conversion of the existing buildings.’

- 1.2 This additional information has now been received and is summarised within Section 3 and considered within Section 8 of the report.
- 1.3 The application was originally presented to Southern Area Planning Committee following a request from the Ward Member as the application was considered to ‘raise issues of more than local public interest’.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is roughly square in shape and lies to the east of Dean Road, at a slight bend in the road, with the existing access being positioned in the north west corner of the plot. The site currently contains two barn buildings, which are currently vacant. Barn A lies is positioned in the north-east corner of the site and has most recently been in use as office accommodation. Barn 2 is positioned in the south-west corner and has most recently been in use as a workshop and showroom for a hot tub business.
- 2.2 The remaining area of the site is largely empty and overgrown in places. There is a storage container adjacent to the access and various piles of materials and equipment dotted around the site. The site boundaries are marked by 1.8m timber fencing, with the exception of the northern boundary, which is formed by the southern elevation of a third barn, which lies within the neighbouring property’s area. There is a gate across the access, which largely screens views of the interior of the site when closed.

2.3 In terms of topography, ground levels change slightly across the site, falling away from west to east. The application site measures approximately 0.14ha in area. There are no trees or significant areas of landscaping within the site boundaries.

2.4 The application site lies within the West Tytherley Conservation Area and within the defined settlement edge for the village.

3.0 **PROPOSAL**

3.1 The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and the erection of 2no detached four-bed dwellings, served via the existing access from Dean Road. The detail of the proposals is set out more fully within the report.

3.2 Following the deferral of the application at the April SAPC meeting, the applicant has submitted financial information relating to the costs involved in the refurbishment and conversion of the existing buildings, as well as anticipated sales values for the resulting dwellings. This information is commercially sensitive and therefore considered confidential. However, the details provided show that the cost of refurbishment work would be prohibitive and render the scheme unviable.

4.0 **HISTORY**

4.1 13/01656/FULLS – Change of use of buildings to provide 1three bed and 1 two bed dwelling and erection of car ports – Permitted, October 2013.

4.2 15/02956/RDCAS – Demolition of existing redundant commercial buildings – under consideration.

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Policy** – no objection (summarised):

- Saved policies of the Borough Local Plan were withdrawn and the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan adopted on 27 January 2016;
- Policies COM2 and LE10 relevant – comments in original response remain relevant;
- Site lies within settlement boundary where principle of development is acceptable;
- Results in loss of employment land and would be departure from adopted plan;
- No objection to principle of the proposal;
- Policy COM7 – financial contribution required equivalent to up to 10% of dwellings to be affordable;
- Policy E5 – consideration needs to be given to potential implications on international designations – New Forest SPA;
- Policy E7 – condition should be applied to secure optional requirement for water efficiency through Building Regulations;
- Policy LHW1 – contributions towards Public Open Space provision required.

Additional comments – dated 23.11.16

- Policy COM7 – regard should be had to resolution of Council on 29 June 2016 in terms of the application of this policy;
- No affordable housing contribution would be sought from this application;
- Policy LHW1 – Council has commenced with implementation of CIL with Reg 123 list identifying off-site public open space as infrastructure funded through CIL;
- Separate contribution towards public open space would not be required;
- Policy T1 – transport infrastructure items are included on Reg 123 list, therefore separate contribution would not be required, subject to Highways consultation response.

5.2 **Design & Conservation** – objection (summarised):

- Buildings are not listed but noted in Conservation Area Appraisal as making positive contribution to character of CA;
- Site already has consent for conversion of buildings to residential use;
- Scheme presented contained little evidence of condition of buildings and repair/upgrading work to allow conversion;
- Required repairs and alterations have now been considered but not convinced all are appropriate;
- Proposed removal of roof trusses is not a conservation approach and raises concerns that specifiers are not experienced in dealing with historic buildings;
- There is over emphasis on need for under pinning;
- No justification why entire roof of both buildings should be removed and replaced, although alludes to some structural faults;
- Not convinced that the options for retaining the integrity of the historic structures has been seriously considered;
- Existing buildings are part of a group of historic buildings similarly noted for their interest – does not seem appropriate to replace them with new, bigger buildings which loosely mimic style and on different footprints;
- Demolition of the buildings constitutes substantial harm/total loss of the non-designated heritage assets;
- Merits of proposed development should be measured in terms of impact on architectural and historic interest of conservation area and the impact of its proposed replacement;
- Loss of the buildings will detrimentally affect the context for the adjacent farm buildings which form part of the group;
- Design of new dwellings is not convincing – proportions are inappropriate and they are domestic and unconvincing as farm buildings;
- Buildings are much larger and more prominent, esp Barn 1, and will be seen above neighbour's cow shed building;
- They do not relate well to neighbouring properties except by paying lip-service with external materials;
- Proposed replacements are likely to be more obtrusive than and poorly related to buildings in the conservation area, and do not conform to Policies ENV14 and ENV15.

Additional comments – dated 25.04.16

- Do not consider amendments are sufficient to overcome concerns raised in initial consultation response;
- Change to roof has reduced length and pitch which now looks out of proportion with rest of design of building;
- If approved, recommend condition for recording to be carried out prior to works commencing.

Additional comments – dated 13.09.16

- No additional comment.

5.3 **Landscape** – comment (summarised):

- Site lies in prominent location along Dean Road within the conservation area;
- No landscape objection to replacement of existing barns but concern re increase in height and increased prominence within street scene;
- Current buildings very low and nestle into surrounding trees and vegetation – whilst visible, they do not detract from countryside surroundings;
- Increasing height significantly will cause dwellings to be overbearing in streetscene.

Additional comments – dated 26.04.16

- Reduced height of Barn 2 would be welcomed in landscape terms as would reduce any visual impact of the building.

5.4 **Ecology** – no objection (summarised):

- Development will affect bats but confident that survey work and proposed mitigation is acceptable and raise no additional concerns.

5.5 **Environmental Health** – no objection (summarised):

- No objection subject to condition re land contamination.

5.6 **HCC Archaeology** – no objection (summarised):

- Site lies in an area of Archaeological potential;
- Due to small scale ground works and the houses being sited in areas already impacted by recent development, would not wish to raise any archaeological concerns.

5.7 **Highways** – no objection:

- Condition re parking provision required;
- No transport contribution required as existing B1 use generates more trips than proposed scheme.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 08.01.2016

6.1 **West Tytherley & Frenchmoor Parish Council** – objection (summarised):

- Objection mainly due to size and height of proposed properties and small gardens they would have;

- Concern re proximity of building to closest neighbour and impact of bedroom window looking directly into neighbour's lounge;
- Additional water will soak away adding to sodden fields and footpaths close to the site;
- Concern re size of 2 4-bed properties in proportion to existing barns which are to be demolished.

Additional comments – 22.06.16 – objection:

- In amended scheme, not enough consideration has been given to not demolishing the existing barns;
- No consideration to flood risk;
- Even though revised ridge height of barns has been reduced, proximity to closest neighbour is still too close;
- Original objection still stands.

6.2 A total of 4 letters of representation were received in respect of the original plans, raising the following concerns:

Design & Layout

- Increase to 2no 4-bed dwellings is an overdevelopment of the plot;
- Planning permission was withdrawn for scheme for 4no houses in 2013;
- Barn 1 fills plot from end to end and nearly double size of existing building, with higher ridge height even with ground being lowered by 1.5m;
- Some plans do not show correct boundary with Heatherdean in vicinity of barn on northern edge of site;
- Area of garden for house is barely more than footprint of house;
- Barn 2 is more than double size of existing building and ridge height increases by 1.6m;
- Proposals are much bigger, bulkier and far too symmetrical;
- Buildings not sited on existing footprints – keeping to existing footprints would preserve the look of the area;
- Overall increase in size and positioning of dwellings is not beneficial to site or village;
- Seems to be significant extra height to the roofline of both barns, particularly Barn 2;
- Para 2.2 is incorrect – boundary is 1.07m south of existing barn and extends eastward to midway between Heatherdean's barn and Barn A;
- Para 8.27 states existing barns are taller than existing barn to north – this is incorrect, as they are both lower;
- Application is for buildings which are much taller than the barns they replace.

Ecology

- No mention of barn owls which frequently roost in barn adjacent to site – height and positioning of Barn 1 could easily drive them away.

Landscape Impact

- Height and length of Barn 1 mean long distance views to hill beyond will be lost.

Amenity Issues

- Bedroom 1 of Barn 1 will look directly into living room of Heatherdene – window is unnecessary and contrary to Policy AME01;
- Bedroom 1 of Barn 1 has window that would look directly into Heatherdean's living room and south facing patio;
- Bedroom windows of Barn 1 will overlook Heatherdean's rear garden – previous application did not have upstairs windows at the back.

Drainage Issues

- Site is already very wet and quantity of water discharged from two houses will be considerable;
- Water will eventually drain into fields at Heatherdean making existing soggy field worse – sheep kept in these fields and will not be good for their health;
- Soakaways do not work in extremely heavy clay soil in this area;
- Question whether proposed new drainage system will cause problems as soakaway planned is very close to boundary of Fieldfare.

Heritage Issues

- Proposal destroys the un-designated heritage assets and replaces them with much larger ones which are out of character with the surrounding area;
- They have a negative impact on the conservation area;
- Any scheme should attempt to preserve the existing buildings and ensure no increase in footprint or building height.

Other Issues

- Submitted plans do not correctly show northern boundary with Heatherdean;
- To allow 2 days as consultation period for new plans is far too short
- Notice of the application coming to committee also very short;
- Number of comments within Design & Access Statement are incorrect.

6.3 Following the receipt of the amended plans on the 20 April, a letter has been received from the occupants of the neighbouring property to the west, Fieldfare, confirming the withdrawal of their previous objections:

- We have no objection to this design of the scheme which now shows a reduction in the height of Barn 2.

6.4 Following receipt of the amended plans dated 6 May, 3 letters of representation have been received, raising the following concerns:

- Demolishing barns and not keeping original footprints will damage character of the yard;
- Use of slate is out of keeping with tiled barn yard;
- All existing buildings and adjoining properties have clay tile roofs;

- Creation of 2no 4-bed properties not using original footprint is overdevelopment;
- Houses are still too large – this is overdevelopment;
- Barn 2 will look weird with the flattened out roof – this will not improve conservation area;
- Barn 1 is too long and too high – glimpse views of hill beyond will be lost forever;
- Conversion of barns would preserve setting of Heatherdean’s barn.

Drainage Issues

- Plans for water disposal involve drainage across neighbouring property;
- Will cause increased water problems for this area;
- Area is full of springs;
- Still doesn’t state how waste water will be disposed off without soakaways.

7.0 POLICY

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

COM2 – Settlement hierarchy

COM7 – Affordable Housing

COM15 - Infrastructure

E1 – High quality development in the Borough

E2 – Protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the Borough

E5 – Biodiversity

E7 – Water management

E9 – Heritage

LHW1 – Public Open Space

LHW4 – Amenity

T1 – Managing movement

T2 – Parking standards

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

West Tytherley Conservation Area Policy Document

Affordable Housing

Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of Development
- Affordable Housing
- Siting, Design & Layout
- Heritage Issues

8.2 Principle of Development

The application site lies within the settlement boundary for West Tytherley, as defined by the Revised Local Plan (RLP). Policy COM2 states that within the boundaries of settlements, the principle of development and redevelopment will be permitted, provided that it is appropriate to the other policies of the RLP. It is also noted that planning permission has previously been granted on this site for the conversion of the existing buildings to two residential units. The principle of residential development on this site is therefore considered acceptable, subject to consideration of the detail of the proposals against the other policies contained within the RLP.

8.3 The buildings, although not currently in use, offer employment floor space which would be lost as a result of this application. However, the principle of this loss of employment use on the site was considered and found to be acceptable under the extant permission for the conversion of the buildings, which is a material consideration. As such, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policy LE10 of the RLP.

8.4 Affordable Housing

Policy COM7 of the RLP relates to the delivery of affordable housing. A report was taken to Cabinet on 22 June 2016 and subsequently to full Council on 29 June 2016, which recommended that the application of policy COM7 of the RLP be revised to bring it in line with the NPPG in respect of the provision of affordable housing on smaller sites. Under the revised wording, there is no requirement for affordable housing in respect of the proposed development.

8.5 Siting, Design & Layout

Policy E1 of the adopted RLP seeks to secure high quality development within the Borough, stating the development will be permitted if it is of a high quality in terms of design and local distinctiveness, and sets a number of criteria to be complied with. These include the need for development to integrate, respect and complement the character of the area, in terms of layout, appearance, scale, materials and building style. It goes on to state that development will not be permitted if it is of poor design and fails to improve the character, function and quality of an area.

8.6 This is supported by Policy E2, which seeks to ensure the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape of the Borough, again setting a number of criteria against which development proposals are to be assessed. It states that development will be permitted provided, amongst other criteria, it does not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the immediate area and the landscape character within which it is located, and that the retention of important landscape features is not likely to be prejudiced. It also requires existing and proposed landscaping features to enable the proposal to integrate positively into the landscape character of the area.

- 8.7 The Planning Statement comments that the proposed scheme has been designed to reflect the farmyard setting, adopting a 'barn-like' style, which reflects preserves the scene which is recognised as being of value within the Conservation Area – as such, it states that the proposed development responds positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would not lead to substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area.
- 8.8 Barn 1 would replace Unit A and would be sited in the north-east corner of the site. The building would be positioned at right angles to the existing barn which lies adjacent to the northern site boundary and would be approximately 4m further into the site than current building. Barn 1 would be 4-bed in size and would address the central courtyard area, with garden space provided predominantly at the rear.
- 8.9 In terms of dimensions, the proposed dwelling is considerably larger than the existing building, with a footprint of approximately 118.1 sqm, compared to the existing building which has a footprint of approximately 87.88 sqm. The dwelling would have an overall height of 6.4m and would be dug into the site by approximately 0.5m to accommodate the changing ground levels. This results in the proposed ridge height being approximately 0.8m higher than that of the existing building. A series of steps would be provided from the main courtyard area as well as a ramped pathway leading across the front elevation, to provide level access to the front entrance.
- 8.10 Barn B would replace Unit 2 and would be positioned in the south-west corner of the application site, largely building over the same footprint at the existing barn. The new dwelling would be set in from the western boundary by 2 to 2.1m along its western elevation, in contrast to the existing building which stands hard on the boundary line. Barn 2 would be a 4-bed property, facing into the central courtyard area, with garden space positioned to the south and east of the dwelling.
- 8.11 In terms of dimensions, the proposed dwelling is again larger than the existing building, with a footprint of approximately 153.6sqm compared to 131.44sqm. In terms of height, the proposed dwelling as originally proposed would have a ridge height of 6.8m, compared to approximately 5m being the highest point of the existing barn. The latest amended plans show the ridge height reduced to approximately 5.7m, thereby reducing the overall bulk and massing of the proposed building. Whilst Barn 2 would read as a more substantial building within the site than the existing, it sits well back from the road frontage and is lower in height than the neighbouring property immediately to the west, Field Fare.
- 8.12 Whilst the site is considered large enough to accommodate the additional built form, in terms of footprint, without resulting in a cramped or overdeveloped appearance to the site, the scale and massing of the proposed dwellings, the relationship of the proposed buildings to the surrounding conservation area and residential properties needs to be considered. It is noted that the Parish Council, along with local residents, has expressed concern regarding the increased size of the proposed dwellings in relation to the existing barns and the potential impact to neighbouring properties.

8.13 Heritage Issues

As noted above, the application site lies within the defined West Tytherley Conservation Area. The 'West Tytherley Conservation Area Policy' document makes reference to the site, stating that there are '...buildings of local interest along Dean Road, including a good group of 19th century farm buildings at Poplar Farm'. Whilst the existing buildings are not listed, the Conservation Officer considers them to be non-designated heritage assets.

- 8.14 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that 'the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application' and that 'a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'. Paragraph 136 goes on to state that LPAs should not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.
- 8.15 This is supported by Policy E9 of the RLP, which states that development and/or works affecting a heritage asset will be permitted provided that:
- a) It would make a positive contribution to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset, taking account of its character, appearance and setting; and
 - b) The significance of the heritage asset has informed the proposal through an assessment proportionate to its importance
- 8.16 The policy goes on to state that the 'merits of development affecting an undesignated heritage asset will be balanced against the scale of harm or loss, either directly or indirectly, to the significance of that heritage asset'.
- 8.17 The supporting Planning Statement acknowledges that the existing buildings are identified as being of local importance for the contribution they make to the Conservation Area. However, it goes on to state that no improvements have been made to the buildings for a considerable period of time and that they are both considered to be at the 'end of their useful economic life'. The buildings are currently vacant and have been so for some time, although it is noted that Barn 2 is used to provide occasional storage space by the applicants. However, neither building is currently in active commercial use.
- 8.18 The application is supported by a 'Condition Survey' report, which concludes that neither building retains much original structure of any merit and that very little of the original 19th century buildings remain. The report concludes that the buildings would require extensive structural works and repair, prior to the works that would be required to convert the buildings to residential use, in order to comply with Building Regulation requirements. It states that it is a prerequisite of 'building control that a conversion to a residential use is able to confirm that the buildings have sufficient structural integrity to enable conversion' and that this is not the case in this instance.

- 8.19 The application is also supported by a Structural Inspection Report, which supports these findings. In respect of Unit A, this report states that in order to convert the building, the entire roof would need to be removed and replaced, as would the ground floor and existing elevations. It also states that the load bearing internal walls would need to be underpinned and that the timber elements of the elevations would need upgrading and all elevations would require additional insulation. In light of the extent of these works and the fact that there are only considered to be three sections of historic timber post within the structure, the report recommends that the building be taken down and rebuilt rather than converted.
- 8.20 In respect of Unit B, the report concludes that once the rear lean-to structure is removed, the main building would be left in a state of partial if not complete collapse. In order to prevent collapse, it states that the roof would need to be removed and repaired, the left and front elevations rebuilt and all elevations would need to be underpinned, with the internal slab level being lowered and additional insulation provided. Again, given the ‘colossal’ amount of repair work and rebuilding required, the report recommends that the building be taken down and rebuilt.
- 8.21 The Conservation Officer has expressed concern regarding the supporting reports and is unconvinced that the options for retaining the integrity of the historic structures have seriously been considered. However, the applicants have confirmed that the scale and cost of the works required to retain the buildings to enable conversion, as permitted under the extant permission, renders the scheme unviable.
- 8.22 In light of the findings of the structural reports, the application seeks permission for the demolition of both the existing buildings, thereby resulting in the loss of the existing non-designated heritage assets. The Conservation Officer states that the demolition of the buildings constitutes substantial harm and that the merits of the proposal should be measured in terms of the impact on the architectural and historic interest of the conservation area and the impact of the proposed replacement.
- 8.23 Whilst accepting that the proposal would result in the total loss of the existing buildings, it is likely that the condition of the buildings will continue to deteriorate over time in the absence of any repair/restoration works.
- 8.24 Following concerns raised by Members at the 26 April SAPC meeting, further information regarding the viability of converting the buildings compared to the proposed demolition and rebuilding of new dwellings, as set out in para 3.2. These figures indicate that the costs of the required refurbishment works would render the scheme unviable and would be so prohibitive that the scheme would not proceed. This supports the applicants’ position that any development involving the retention and conversion of the buildings unviable.
- 8.25 That said, It is also important to note that Policy E9 does not require the applicant to demonstrate that the buildings are not capable of being restored or converted, in order to find the principle of demolition acceptable. This is a distinct change from Policy ENV14 of the former local plan.

- 8.26 It is acknowledged that the existing buildings form part of a group of buildings in this section of the conservation area, with the most obvious group value being with the existing barn that lies along the northern boundary of the site, which is also the most prominent in terms of the conservation area setting. The Conservation Officer has commented that the loss of the buildings would 'detrimentally affect the context for the adjacent farm buildings'. However, the existing barn to the north falls outside of the application site and would continue to define and enclose the northern area of the site, retaining the historic agricultural character. It is also noted that the Conservation Officer does not consider that the existing buildings are worthy of listing in their own right.
- 8.27 The repositioning of the proposed new buildings and their increased footprints within the site aims to reinforce the group value, by aligning the buildings more closely around the central courtyard area and providing a greater sense of enclosure to the eastern and southern sides of the courtyard, which is more in keeping with the positioning of the neighbouring barn. The proposals would also enhance the treatment of this central courtyard area, with new hard landscaping to create a more attractive, positive appearance to this area. As with the materials for the new buildings themselves, a condition is recommended requiring full details and samples of the proposed hard landscaping materials to be submitted for approval, to ensure a sympathetic visual relationship to the existing barn and proposed dwellings.
- 8.28 Following receipt of the latest amended plans, whilst the Conservation Officer notes that the changes to Barn 1 are an improvement, the changes to the scheme overall are not considered to have addressed previous concerns. It is also stated that the change to the roof form of Barn 2 is not considered a 'positive alteration'. The Landscape Officer however has welcomed this change, stating that the visual impact of the proposed building would be reduced.
- 8.29 As noted above, the proposed dwellings are larger in footprint and overall scale than the existing barns and the Parish Council has objected to the proposals on these grounds. However, this in itself does not make the proposals unacceptable. As discussed above, the site is large enough to accommodate the additional footprint of both new dwellings, without resulting in a cramped or overdeveloped appearance to the site. The existing barns are different in scale and form to the existing barn to the northern boundary and all three of the existing buildings differ from each other in design, albeit having similar external materials. The existing buildings also differ in design from the neighbouring properties, as would again be the case with the proposed scheme.
- 8.30 Within the D&A Statement, traditional barn-style properties are described as being 'generally simple in form with minimal openings' and 'eaves lines are generally simple', characteristics which are reflected in the design of the proposed dwellings. The Planning Statement describes the dwellings as adopting a 'traditional barn form', with 'limited openings to the courtyard to reflect the utilitarian character of traditional farm buildings'. The proposed

dwellings are attractive in design, with a strong barn like appearance but also incorporate domestic features, signifying their use, with the positioning of the entrances for example and the use and positioning of fenestration. This is considered an acceptable and successful design solution for the site. The use of traditional materials will result in a sympathetic appearance to the remaining agricultural buildings on the neighbouring sites and the design of the dwellings will add to the existing mix of property styles and sizes in the immediate area, which combine to add to the overall character and interest of this section of the conservation area.

- 8.31 The resulting buildings would be visible from Dean Road, with views into the site through the access point and would, as explained above, be larger than the existing barns. However, this additional height and massing is not considered to be detrimental to the overall character or appearance of the site or this section of the conservation area. Both buildings are set well back from the road frontage and would therefore not appear as overbearing or unduly dominant, being lower in height than the neighbouring properties which are much closer to the Dean Road frontage. Barn 1 would be dug into the site, further lowering the overall ridge height and Barn 2 would be viewed at an oblique angle, extending into the site, away from the Dean Road frontage. Views from the street scene would predominantly be of the roof areas of the dwellings, as is the case currently. However, with high quality materials and detailing, it is not considered the proposed buildings would be unduly prominent or visually intrusive within the established street scene and surrounding conservation area setting. Whilst the concerns of the Conservation Officer are noted in this respect, it is not considered that the proposals would result in a level of harm that would be so significant as to warrant a refusal of permission in this instance. In addition, the improvements to the treatment of the resulting central courtyard area in terms of hard landscaping and layout, would also be an enhancement in terms of the appearance of the site within the street scene.
- 8.32 Overall, it is therefore considered that the proposed development would make a positive contribution to enhancing the significance of the heritage asset, in that the scheme responds positively to and is sympathetic to the existing character, appearance and setting of the surrounding conservation area. The merits of the proposed development, in terms of improving the overall appearance of the site, the delivery of well designed, attractive housing, the removal of a commercial use from a predominantly residential area and bringing the site back into active use, are considered to outweigh the harm caused by the loss of the non-designated heritage assets, these being the existing buildings. Overall, it is therefore considered that the proposed development complies with the aims of paragraph 135 of the NPPF and the requirements of Policy E1, E2 and E9 of the RLP.
- 8.33 Policy E7 of the RLP relates to water management and requires all new homes to achieve a water consumption standard of no more than 110 litres per person per day. A condition is therefore recommended to ensure compliance with this requirement.

8.34 Relationship to Neighbouring Properties

In terms of Barn 1, the change to the siting of the proposed building within the application site and the increased scale and bulk of the dwelling compared to the existing building need to be considered in terms of any potential impact to neighbouring properties. Barn 1 would be positioned in the north-east corner of the site, adjacent to the common boundary with the neighbouring dwelling, Heatherdean, which lies immediately to the north of the application site. Heatherdean is a large detached dwelling with extensive grounds which contain a number of outbuildings, including the existing barn which lies along and encloses the northern boundary of the application site. The house itself is approximately 26m from the common boundary with the application site.

8.35 Due to the resiting of the proposed dwelling further into the site, the northern side elevation would be visible between the two outbuildings which lie on Heatherdean's side of the boundary. The proposed elevation would be set in approximately 3m from the boundary, therefore approximately 29m from Heatherdean itself. The amended plans do not show any windows proposed in this northern elevation, addressing concerns expressed in respect of the original design submitted.

8.36 The garden area to Heatherdean also wraps around the eastern boundary of the application site, with the existing barn clearly visible above the fence which lies along this boundary. Again, there is an outbuilding positioned within Heatherdean's grounds, which backs on to the eastern boundary. The proposed new dwelling would have a number of windows facing the eastern boundary – these would be patio style doors serving the family room and living room areas and picture windows to the study and utility room at ground floor and the four bedrooms at first floor level.

8.37 As noted above, planning permission has already been granted for the conversion of the existing barn to residential use, under application 13/01656/FULLS. The approved plans for this previous permission show the retention of the existing windows in the rear elevation of the barn, which are closer to the boundary than those proposed in the current application. Given the increased distance from the rear elevation to the boundary and the provision of 1.8m fencing, it is not considered that there would be any adverse degree of overlooking or loss of privacy to this section of Heatherdean's garden to justify a refusal of planning permission.

8.38 With regards to Barn B, there would be a separation of approximately 15.2 to 16.4m between the western elevation of the proposed dwelling and the existing property to the west. The western side elevation does not contain any ground floor windows and has a small window at first floor level, which is a secondary window to bedroom 2. The plans indicate that this window is to be obscure glazed and a condition is recommended to secure this. It is therefore not considered that there would be any overlooking or loss of privacy to the

neighbouring property. The rear elevation (south) contains a number of windows at ground and first floor level – this elevation is set between 4m and 8m from the boundary which is screened with 1.8m fencing. Again, given the position of the rear elevation in relation to the boundary, it is not considered that there would be any adverse degree of overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

8.39 In light of the comments above, it is not considered that the proposed new dwellings would result in any unacceptable degree of harm to the amenities of the neighbouring properties. As such, the proposals are considered to comply with Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

8.40 **Ecology**

The application is supported by a 'Bat Survey Report – Updated Phase 2' Report.

8.41 Impact on Internationally Designated Sites

The application site lies within close proximity to and is considered to have the potential to affect sites of European importance for nature conservation. Such sites are afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, (as amended). The Habitats Regulations place a requirement on the Council as the 'competent authority' and 'decision-taker' to assess any likely significant effect of any development on a European designated site, either alone or in combination with other development, where such development is not directly connected to the management of the site for nature conservation.

8.42 *New Forest SPA/SAC/Ramsar/SSSI*

The application site lies within a 13.6km catchment area for the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA), in which research has indicated there is a risk of increased visitor numbers and recreational pressure on the SPA, as a result of additional residential development within this area. This site supports a range of bird species which are vulnerable to impacts from increased recreational use of the sites, resulting from additional housing development. While one house on its own would not have a significant impact, it has been demonstrated through research, supported by Natural England, that any net increase in dwelling numbers would contribute to an in-combination likely significant effect on the identified Special Protection Area.

8.43 In order to address this impact, mitigation measures are required. With respect to the New Forest SPA, the Council has adopted the 'New Forest SPA Mitigation – Interim Framework' which proposes a number of mitigation options where it is considered that proposed development would result in a 'likely significant effect' on the interest features of the SPA. One such measure is a financial contribution of £1,300 per unit, to go towards the off-site provision of an area of 'suitable alternative natural greenspace'. This approach is proposed in respect of this application.

- 8.44 In considering the need for obligations for a financial contribution for off-site mitigation, due consideration has been given to the three tests as set out within Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). The contribution is based on the number of dwellings proposed and is considered fair and reasonable in scale and kind. Without mitigation the proposal would be likely to give rise to significant effects on the SPA contrary to the Habitats Regulations. Therefore, subject to this contribution being secured via a legal agreement, the proposal would meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and be in accordance with Policy E5 of the emerging Revised Local Plan.
- 8.45 Impact on Protected Species
Bats receive protection under UK law via the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under EU law by the Habitats Directive, which is transposed into UK law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, commonly referred to as the Habitats Regulations. Local Planning Authorities are required to engage with the Habitats Regulations – planning permission should be granted (other concerns notwithstanding) unless the development is likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive and, if a breach is considered likely, that the development is unlikely to be granted an EPS licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law. EPS licences will not normally be granted in the absence of planning permission.
- 8.46 *Is the development likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive?*
The application is supported by a report of the bat survey work which has been carried out at the site to appropriate methodologies and standards. The report includes results and conclusions of the full survey work, an assessment of the impact to bats and the measures proposed to ensure that any impact to bats is avoided or compensated for. The report also builds on previous survey work carried out by other consultancies. Overall, the Council's Ecologist has confirmed that the report presents an excellent picture of bat use at the site.
- 8.47 The survey work identified that the existing buildings provide numerous points that can be used by bats for roosting/access to roosts, and subsequent emergence and re-entry surveys identified a peak of 13no common pipistrelle and one soprano pipistrelle bat using the buildings. It is not considered that there is a maternity roost present.
- 8.48 The development will result in the loss of roosts used by individual non-breeding bats. If avoidance measures are not taken, then the work has the potential to kill/injure individual bats. The development is therefore considered likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive.
- 8.49 *Is the development unlikely to be licenced?*
An EPS licence can only be granted if the development is able to meet three tests:
1. *The consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences for the natural environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))*

2. *There must be no ‘satisfactory alternative’ (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and*
3. *The action authorised ‘will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range’ (Regulation 53(9)(b)).*

- 8.50 With regards to the first and second tests, the proposals are considered to be of public benefit in social and economic terms, in that the site will be brought back into use and will deliver high quality housing and make a positive contribution to the surrounding conservation area. The site lies within the applicant’s control and the scheme can therefore be delivered and it is understood that there are no other alternative sites within the applicant’s ownership that offer the same opportunities.
- 8.51 In order to assess the development against the third test, sufficient details must be available to show how killing/injury of bats will be avoided and how the impacts to bats will be addressed, which should be proportionate and appropriate to the impacts as determined through the survey work. In this case, a detailed strategy is provided that includes methods to be followed during the development to ensure bats are not disturbed, killed or injured, together with new roosting opportunities to be provided in the roofs of the new barns. These are also shown in the submitted plans.
- 8.52 The Council’s Ecologist has confirmed support for all these measures and that subject to the first two tests being met, has commented that he is confident that the development is not unlikely to be licenced. It is therefore recommended that a condition be applied requiring the development to proceed in accordance with the measures set out within the Bat Survey Report. Overall, the proposals are considered to comply with the aims of Policy E5 of the RLP and the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.
- 8.53 **Highway Issues**
Access
Policy T1 of the RLP states that development will be permitted providing, amongst other criteria, that the internal layout and access is ‘safe, attractive, in character, functional and accessible for all users’. The site is currently accessed from Dean Road, via an access point in the northwest corner of the site, which is to be retained. The Highways Officer has raised no objection to this element of the proposals in terms of layout or highway safety concerns and as such, the access proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policy T1 of the adopted Local Plan.
- 8.54 Parking provision
Policy T2 of the RLP relates to parking standards, with Annex G setting out the minimum parking standards required for development. For 4 bed dwellings, a minimum of 3 off-road spaces are required. The proposed site layout shows three parking spaces for each dwelling with cycle storage also proposed within the rear garden areas. The Highways Officer has raised no objection to this element of the scheme and the proposals are therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy T2 of the adopted Local Plan.

8.55 Drainage

Each building would be connected to a new foul water treatment plant, with discharge to a soakaway within the application site. Surface water drainage would also be via soakaways. A condition is recommended to require full details of the proposed foul drainage and surface water details for approval and subject to this condition, the proposals are considered to comply with Policy COM15 of the RLP.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 Whilst noting Members' reason for deferring the application in April and the consideration of the financial information submitted in response to these concerns, it is considered that the scheme is acceptable in relation to the policy guidance within the RLP. The proposed dwellings could be accommodated within the application site without resulting in a cramped or awkward layout or any adverse impact to the amenities of the neighbouring properties or the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposals are considered to make a positive contribution to the enhancing the significance of the surrounding heritage asset, (the conservation area) with the merits of the development outweighing the loss of the non-designated heritage assets, these being the existing barns. It is therefore recommended that subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure the required contributions to offset the impact of the development to the New Forest SPA, that planning permission be granted.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building for the completion of a legal agreement to secure the following:

- **Financial contribution towards the 'New Forest SPA Mitigation – Interim Framework' for off-site mitigation measures**

Then PERMISSION subject to:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.**
2. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans:
Site Location Plan – drawing 1700/P01 Rev A
Existing Site & Roof Plan – drawing 1700/P02
Proposed Site Plan – drawing 1700/P03 Rev A
Proposed Site Sections AA, BB, CC – drawing 1700/P04 Rev B
Proposed Barn 1 Floor Plans – drawing 1700/P05 Rev D
Proposed Barn 1 Elevations – drawing 1700/P06 Rev D
Proposed Barn 2 Floor Plans – drawing 1700/P07 Rev D
Proposed Barn 2 Elevations – drawing 1700/P08 Rev D
Proposed Barns 1 & 2 Roof Plans – drawing 1700/P09
Proposed Bin & Bike Stores – drawing 1700/P10**

Existing Plans: Building A – drawing 1700/S01

Existing Elevations: Building A – drawing 1700/S02

Existing Plans: Building B – drawing 1700/S03

Existing Elevations: Building B – drawing 1700/S04

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the measures set out in Section 5.5, 'Bat Mitigation Plan' of the *Bat Survey Report – Updated Phase 2 Report*, (Winchester Bat Consultancy, 2015), unless varied by a European Protected Species (EPS) licence subsequently issued by Natural England. Thereafter, the replacement bat roosts shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: to ensure the favourable conservation status of bats in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 4. The development hereby approved shall be designed and built to meet Regulation 36 2 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015.**

Reason: In the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 5. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Implementation shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 6. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use or occupied until the approved parking provision has been laid out and provided for use in accordance with the approved plan and this space(s) shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy T2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 7. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details, including plans and cross sections, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the height of the ground floor slab of the new building. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure satisfactory relationship between the new development and the adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees in accordance with Policies LHW4 and E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 8. Prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted full details of hard and soft landscape works including planting plans; written specifications (stating cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities and an implementation programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall also include; proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure and hard surfacing materials (where appropriate). The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme.**

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 9. The first floor window in the western elevation of Barn 2 shall be obscure glazed and non-opening and shall be retained in this condition.**

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the neighbouring property in accordance with 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.**
-

APPENDIX B

Officer Update Report to Southern Area Planning Committee on 13 December 2016

APPLICATION NO.	15/02936/FULLS
SITE	Poplar Farm, Dean Road, West Tytherley, SP5 1NR, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
COMMITTEE DATE	13 December 2016
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	45 - 76

1.0 **AMENDMENTS**

1.1 **Para 4.1** – Application 13/01656/FULLS has now expired and can therefore no longer be implemented.

1.2 **Para 8.44** – remove word ‘emerging’ from last sentence

1.3 An additional condition is recommended to secure details of the proposed drainage strategy for the site, as referred to in paragraph 8.54 of the report, the details of which are set out below.

2.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building for the completion of a legal agreement to secure the following:

- **Financial contribution towards the ‘New Forest SPA Mitigation – Interim Framework’ for off-site mitigation measures**

Then PERMISSION subject to conditions 1 to 9, Note 1 and the additional condition:

10. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, full details of the proposed surface water and foul drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Implementation shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage provision on the site, in accordance with Policy COM15 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
