

ITEM 7

APPLICATION NO.	16/03181/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	19.12.2016
APPLICANT	Simon Bull, Hazeley Developments Ltd
SITE	Banksia, Romsey Road, Awbridge, SO51 0HG, AWBRIDGE
PROPOSAL	Erection of 4x 4-bed dwellings with detached garages; new access to Romsey Road and alterations to existing access; landscaping works and provision of parking, and associated infrastructure (Amended Scheme)
AMENDMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amended ecological appraisal received 26/01/2017• Amended plan received 03/02/2017 showing widening of driveway to plot 3
CASE OFFICER	Mrs Sarah Appleton

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 21 February 2017 to refuse planning permission for the proposed development. This resolution is contrary to the officer recommendation 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 21 February 2017 SAPC meeting are appended to this report as Appendices A and B.

2.0 UPDATES

2.1 Additional plan

The applicant has submitted an additional plan which shows the differences in the siting of the dwellings refused under application 16/02043/FULLS and those being considered under this current application. The additional plan is included as part of this report.

2.2 Amended plans

Amended plans were reported verbally at SAPC. To confirm, amended plans were received on 04/01/2017 and 02/02/2017 showing increase in size of garage to plot 3 to ensure a length of 6 metres and also an increase in size of the external parking spaces to plot 3. These amended plans are included as part of this report.

2.3 SAPC viewing panel

A viewing panel was held for SAPC on Friday 17 February 2017. Members who attended were Councillors Adams-King, Bailey, Bundy, Cooper, Hurst, Johnston and Richards. Apologies were received from Councillors Baverstock, Collier, A. Dowden, C. Dowden, Finley and Hibberd.

3.0 **ADDITIONAL CONSULTATIONS**

3.1 **Conservation** – No objection

4.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

4.1 Amendments from the refused application

Paragraphs 4.1 to 4.4 of the SAPC update paper outline the differences between the previously refused application (16/02043/FULLS) and the current proposals. The following gives further information in relation to the differences between the two schemes in relation to the neighbouring dwellings at The Byre and York House. Please note that the measurements below are approximate.

4.2

Distance between front elevation of plot 3 with rear elevation of The Byre (Refused Scheme)	42.5 metres
Distance between front elevation of plot 3 with rear elevation of The Byre (Current Scheme)	37 metres
Distance between front elevation of plot 4 with rear elevation of The Byre (Refused Scheme)	57 metres
Distance between front elevation plot 4 with rear elevation of The Byre (Current Scheme)	57 metres

Distance between front elevation of plot 2 and main rear elevation of York House (Refused Scheme)	28.7 metres
Distance between front elevation of plot 2 and main rear elevation of York House (Current Scheme)	29.3 metres

4.3 Planning considerations

SAPC resolved to refuse the application for five reasons. Members at SAPC considered that the layout of the proposed development would result in the following unacceptable impacts:

- Layout of plots 2-4 would result in a contrived, cramped form of development out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area
- Dwelling at plot 2 due to its position adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at York House would result in direct overlooking into the rear garden of York House which would adversely impact on the occupiers amenities.
- Dwellings on plots 3 and 4 would result in adverse overlooking into the neighbouring dwelling at The Byre.
- Proposed siting of the access road adjacent to the common boundary with The Byre would give rise to an adverse level of noise and disturbance to this neighbouring dwelling to the detriment of residential amenities.

- Proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the existing dwelling known as “Banksia” which is considered an undesignated heritage asset.

4.4 Layout of plots 2-4

SAPC were of the view that the layout of plots 2-4 to the rear of the site in comparison with the character of the surrounding area would result in a contrived and cramped form of development mainly due to the amount of dwellings proposed combined with their close proximity to each other. In particular, SAPC were of the view that the plot sizes proposed, being smaller than those seen in the immediate vicinity, would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

4.5 The character of the surrounding area is described at paragraph 8.3 of the agenda report. The submitted plans show that the plot sizes proposed for the dwellings, whilst they are considered appropriate in their size in relation to the size of the proposed dwellings, are smaller than those in the immediate vicinity. It is also noted that the dwellings would be situated in a back land location in an area that is characterised by a strong linear form.

4.6 Notwithstanding the above, in order to substantiate a reason for refusal, whether any demonstrable harm would arise from smaller plot sizes/back land development needs to be considered.

4.7 In this case, the height of the proposed dwellings to the rear of the site would be lower than the existing dwelling ‘Banksia’ and proposed plot 1. In addition, it is considered that the proposed layout would allow some permeability through the site, for example, when viewing the site between Banksia and plot 1 from Romsey Road the gap between plots 2 and 3 will be appreciated. As a result of both the proposed layout and height of the dwellings to the rear of the plot, it is not considered that these would be the dominant buildings when viewing the site from Romsey Road. It is noted that plot 4 would be visible from the access however, this dwelling would be set back approximately 85 metres and as such, it is not considered that this dwelling dominate views from the highway.

4.8 As a result of the above, Officers are of the view that whilst the proposed dwellings to the rear of the site would constitute back land development and would have smaller plots than surrounding dwellings, the layout and height of plots 2-4 would result in them being subservient to Banksia and plot 1 resulting in the strong linear form that is characteristic of this part of Awbridge being retained. In addition, as a result of the layout and height of plots 2-4, it is not considered that the smaller plot sizes would be seen in context with the surrounding, existing development. Officers conclude therefore that the proposed development would not result in any demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

4.9 Relationship between plot 2 and York House

SAPC considered that the proposed dwelling on plot 2 would result in direct, adverse overlooking into the rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling at York House, contrary to policy LHW4 of the RLP.

4.10 Proposed plot 2 would be adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at York House. Plot 2 would be located approximately 25 metres from the existing rear wall of the rear projection at York House. The submitted plans also show that Plot 2 would be located approximately 29 metres from the main rear wall of York House. As a result of these distances, it is not considered that plot 2 would result in any adverse overlooking into the dwelling at York House itself. The impact plot 2 would have on the garden of York House is discussed below.

4.11 The dwelling at plot 2 has been marginally re-sited since the previous refused application where it was considered that plot 2 would result in adverse overlooking into the rear garden of York House. More significantly, the internal layout of plot 2 has been re-configured. Previously, plot 2 included a bedroom window adjacent to the boundary. This window has been replaced by an en-suite window. In addition, the applicant has proposed additional planting on the boundary (details secured by a condition). The proposed detached garage would also help to interrupt views. As a result of this and as a result of the revised first floor layout proposed for plot 2 it is not considered that the en-suite window would result in any adverse overlooking into the rear garden of York House.

4.12 No other windows included within plot 2 are considered to result in any adverse overlooking into the rear garden of York House. Officers are of the opinion that the development would not result in sufficient overlooking to justify a reason for refusal.

4.13 Relationship between plots 3 and 4 and The Byre

SAPC considered that as a result of the distance between plots 3 and 4 and the neighbouring dwelling at The Byre, the proposed development would result in direct, adverse overlooking into this neighbouring property.

4.14 With regards to this, Officers are of the opinion that the separation distance between plots 3 and 4 and The Byre is sufficient such that overlooking from these plots would not adversely impact on the amenities of the occupiers of The Byre.

4.15 With regards to the impact plot 3 would have on The Byre. This property would have a separation of approximately 37 metres from the rear elevation of The Byre. In addition, plot 3 would not be located directly to the rear of The Byre. Plot 3 would be located approximately 14 metres from the boundary with The Byre (measurement taken from main side wall of proposed dwelling) and as such, any views into The Byre would be at an oblique angle. As a result of the separation distance between plot 3 and The Byre and the oblique nature of the views from plot 3, even with a slight levels change, it is not considered that plot 3 would result in any adverse overlooking into The Byre that would warrant refusing the application.

- 4.16 With regards to the impact plot 4 would have on The Byre, the separation between these two properties would be approximately 57 metres. Again, plot 4 would not be located directly to the rear of The Byre and as such, views to the rear of The Byre would again be oblique. As a result it is not considered that plot 4 would result in any adverse overlooking into The Byre that would warrant refusing the application.
- 4.17 Proposed access road and impact on The Byre
The proposed access road to the dwellings to the rear of the plot would be adjacent to the boundary with The Byre. SAPC considered that the frequency of traffic movements along this access would be such that it would result in an adverse impact in terms of noise and disturbance to the occupiers of The Byre.
- 4.18 The proposed access road would be located approximately 3 metres from the boundary with The Byre. The Byre is then located approximately 8 metres from the boundary giving a total separation distance of approximately 11 metres between the dwelling at The Byre and the proposed access road. Plans from 2009 when planning permission was granted for the dwelling at The Byre show that the windows on the elevation adjacent to Banksia serve a study, dining room, larder and utility at ground floor level and a bathroom and bedroom at first floor level.
- 4.19 The submitted plans show that the access road would be separated from the boundary by an area of soft landscaping (secured by a condition on any permission). The submitted plans also show that the access road would be surfaced with block paving which would help to prevent noise impacts from vehicles associated with the proposed dwellings. In addition the highways officer has confirmed that for the 3 dwellings to the rear of the site he would expect approximately 30-35 multi-modal trips between 7am – 7pm. Multi-modal trips are not confined to trips by car, but also include trips by bicycle and by foot. To break this figure down further, if you were to divide 35 (the maximum of trips expected) by 12 there would be an average of 2.9 multi-modal trips per hour (car, bicycle and foot). It is not considered that such movements would result in adverse harm to the amenities of the occupier of The Byre.
- 4.20 As a result of the layout and construction of the driveway and as a result of the amount of traffic movements expected from the proposed development, it is not considered that the proposals would result in an adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of The Byre. As such, it is not considered that a reason for refusal on this basis can be substantiated.
- 4.21 Undesignated heritage asset
SAPC considered that the proposals would result in an adverse and detrimental impact to the significance of the existing property 'Banksia' which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. SAPC considered that the proposals would harm the character and original features of this building.

- 4.22 Since the SAPC meeting, the Council's conservation officer has been consulted on the proposals and the impact they would have on the existing dwelling. The conservation officer has visited the site and has raised no objections to the proposed development. They consider that Banksia is a non-designated heritage asset.
- 4.23 The conservation officer considers that Banksia is an attractive building, which is clearly of some age and significance to the village, and which makes a positive contribution to the street scene. The conservation officer has raised no objection to the proposed erection of a building to the side of Banksia, particularly as the proposed dwelling respects its design and scale. The design of the existing house is quite urban in style, and would more normally be seen in the context of other buildings, rather than this more isolated position. Therefore it is considered that Banksia should be capable of accommodating an additional building erected next to it without harm to its setting.
- 4.24 In addition to the above, the conservation officer is of the view that the buildings to the rear of the site would be erected at a sufficient distance that Banksia should still be afforded a garden proportionate to the size of the house. The conservation officer also notes that the buildings to the rear would not be readily visible from the street with Banksia remaining the dominant building.
- 4.25 As a result of the above, Officers consider that the proposed development would not result in harm to the setting of Banksia and that the proposals comply with policy E9 of the RLP. A reason for refusal on the basis of harm to this undesignated heritage asset cannot therefore be supported by Officers.
- 4.26 **Other matters**
SAPC raised other concerns with regards to drainage. Drainage is a material planning consideration insofar that the local planning authority has to be satisfied that the site can be adequately drained. Any further detailed drainage matters are dealt with at the more detailed design stage under Building Regulations. Since SAPC, the applicant has submitted their drainage assessment report (March 2017) which is site specific and looks at drainage solutions for the site for both foul and surface water drainage. The assessment has been undertaken by Cowan Consultancy (structural, civil and building consultants) and concludes:

"It has been proven, by on site testing, that the subsoil beneath the site is well suited for soakaway type drainage and this is how the existing site deals with its storm water. Therefore to maintain this sustainable drainage solution (SUDS) the storm water run-off from the new development will be dealt with directly on site via new soakaways... These will be designed to discharge and temporarily store the storm water run-off volumes for the design storms already stated previously in this report and noted within the appended calculations..."

...The foul drainage on the site will connect into a new sewerage treatment plant...This will in turn treat the effluent and then discharge into a suitably sized land drainage field positioned on site. This modern treatment system will replace the existing historic cess pit type foul drainage found on site and will therefore reduce the likelihood of untreated effluent being released on site and thus better safe guard ground water on site and improve water quality..."

Officers are satisfied that the site can be adequately drained and as such, it is considered that the application is acceptable in this regard. The drainage assessment that has been provided by the applicant has been forwarded to Building Control and their comments will be provided in the update to the Planning Control Committee.

5.0 **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above considerations, officers are of the opinion that the proposal would be appropriate in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, neighbour amenities and setting of the undesignated heritage asset. Officers remain of the opinion that the proposals would be in accordance with the relevant policies contained within the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and appropriate conditions listed below.

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

- 1. The proposed development as a result of the layout of plots 2-4 to the rear of the site, the number of units proposed and their close proximity to each other would result in a contrived, cramped form of development out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The application is therefore contrary to policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 2. The proposed dwelling on plot 2 of the proposed development, due to its position adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at York House and the distance between this plot and York House would result in direct overlooking into the rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling at York House which would adversely affect the privacy of the occupiers contrary to policy LHW4(a) of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 3. The proposed dwellings on plots 3 and 4 of the proposed development, due to their position in close proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at The Byre and the respective distance between these properties would result in direct overlooking into the rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling at The Byre which would adversely affect the privacy of the occupiers contrary to policy LHW4(a) of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

4. **The proposed siting of the access road into the site to serve the development lies immediately adjacent to the common boundary with The Byre. As a consequence of the position of the road and the frequency of traffic movements associated with the development the proposal would give rise to an adverse level of noise and disturbance to the occupiers of The Byre to the detriment of their living conditions, contrary to policy LHW4(a) of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
5. **The proposal would result in an adverse and detrimental impact to the significance of the existing property known as “Banksia” which represents an un-designated heritage asset. The dwelling was one of two that was built by a local builder prior to the First World War and its significance, locally, is also reflected in its visual prominence in the street scene, the fabric of the building e.g. original features and timber front door, and its symmetrical front elevation. The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the stated benefits of the proposal when balanced against the scale of the harm identified to this undesignated heritage asset, justify the grant of planning permission when set against policy E9(a) of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

7.0 RECOMMENDATION of HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING 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. **No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out 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 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.**
3. **Prior to the commencement of development the access shall be constructed with the visibility splays of 2.4 by 43 metres and maintained as such at all times. Within these visibility splays notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no obstacles, including walls, fences and vegetation, shall exceed the height of 1 metre above the level of the existing carriageway at any time.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.**

- 4. Any gates shall be set back at least 5 metres from the edge of the carriageway of the adjoining highway and the access shall be splayed at an angle of 45 degrees from this point to the edge of the highway.**
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
- 5. At least the first 5 metres of the access track measured from the nearside edge of carriageway of the adjacent highway shall be surfaced in a non-migratory material prior to the use of the access commencing and retained as such at all times.**
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
- 6. The development shall not be occupied until space has been laid out and provided for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles to enable them to enter and leave the site in a forward gear in accordance with the approved plan and this space shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.**
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
- 7. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out within the Eco Urban Ltd Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement reference 16767-AIA dated 19 August 2016.**
Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 8. Tree protective measures installed (in accordance with the tree protection condition above) shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or until such time as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities, nor material storage, nor placement of site huts or other equipment whatsoever shall take place within the barrier.**
Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 9. All service routes, drain runs, soakaways or excavations in connection with the development hereby permitted shall remain wholly outside the tree protective barrier.**
Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 10. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until full details of hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include-where appropriate: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and**

structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme and in accordance with the management plan.

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 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.

- 11. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until a schedule of landscape management and maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas and an implementation programme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by proper maintenance of existing and new landscape features as an improvement of the appearance of the site and to enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.

- 12. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the submitted 'Ecological Appraisal & Phase 1 and 2 Bat Surveys' report (Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services April 2016 updated August and November 2016 and January 2017) specifically the conclusions and recommendations set out in section 5.0.**

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and protected species in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E5.

- 13. Before the development of the dwellings hereby permitted reaches damp proof course level, details of biodiversity enhancements to be incorporated into the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with any such approved details.**

Reason: To enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 14. 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.

- 15. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers:**

D01 Rev D – Site Plan as Proposed

7210/2/D02 – Plot 1 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D03 – Plot 2 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D04 Rev A – Plot 3 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D05 – Plot 4 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D06 – Plot 1 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D07 – Plot 2 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D08 Rev A – Plot 3 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D09 – Plot 4 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D11 – Garage Floor Plans and Elevations

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

Notes 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.**
 - 2. Separate permission is required under the Highways Act 1980 to construct/amend/close an access. Please contact the Head of Highways, Hampshire County Council, Jacobs Gutter Lane, Hounslow, Totton SOUTHAMPTON, SO40 9TQ, Tel. No. 03005551388 or at roads@hants.gov.uk at least 12 weeks prior to the access works commencing**
-

APPENDIX A

Officer Report to Southern Area Planning Committee on 21 February 2017

APPLICATION NO.	16/03181/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	19.12.2016
APPLICANT	Simon Bull, Hazeley Developments Ltd
SITE	Banksia , Romsey Road, Awbridge, SO51 0HG, AWBRIDGE
PROPOSAL	Erection of 4x 4-bed dwellings with detached garages; new access to Romsey Road and alterations to existing access; landscaping works and provision of parking, and associated infrastructure (Amended Scheme)
AMENDMENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amended ecological appraisal received 26/01/2017• Amended plan received 03/02/2017 showing widening of driveway to plot 3
CASE OFFICER	Mrs Sarah Appleton

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason of the considerable amount of interest in the proposals.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site relates to a detached property located in the village of Awbridge. The site contains a Victorian detached property set in a substantial plot. The existing dwelling (Banksia) is part of a linear form of development along Romsey Road with its main garden area to the rear. The site is mainly bounded by vegetative boundaries which include some mature trees. Other boundaries consist of wooden fencing. Existing vehicular access is taken from Romsey Road.

2.2 It is understood that the dwelling on the site has been unoccupied for some time. Since the applicant purchased the site, much of the garden has been cleared and some outbuildings removed.

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The existing dwelling on the site is proposed to be retained. Three additional, detached dwelling are proposed to the rear of the site and another dwelling is proposed adjacent to the north west boundary of the existing dwelling.

- 3.2 The proposal would result in the modification of the existing access into the site. Plot 1 (the proposed dwelling to the side of the existing) would have its own (new) access onto Romsey Road, whilst plots 2, 3 and 4 would be accessed from a new driveway off Romsey Road. Plot 1 would include off-street parking spaces along with turning space to the front. Plots 2, and 4 would each include detached double garage and driveway parking. Plot 3 would include a single garage and driveway parking.
- 3.3 The proposed dwellings would be 2 storey and 1.5 storey in height and would each have 4 bedrooms. The external materials used in the construction of the dwellings would include the following:
- Plain clay tiles, natural slate
 - Red/orange brickwork
 - Render
 - Timber sash windows and timber casements
 - Stone cills and lintels

The proposed dwellings would be traditional in their design and would include gabled front projections, pitched roof dormer windows and hipped roofs. The dwellings would have an approximate ridge height of 8 metres (plot 1) and 8.4 metres (plots 2, 3 and 4).

- 3.4 Proposed boundary treatments would include trees and hedges.

4.0 **HISTORY**

- 4.1 16/02043/FULLS – Erection of 4 x 4-bed dwellings with detached garages, new access to Romsey Road and alterations to existing access; landscaping works and provision of parking, and associated infrastructure – REFUSE 19/10/2016 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development as a result of the layout of plots 2-4 to the rear of the site and due to the scale of the dwellings and their close proximity to each other would result in a contrived, cramped form of development out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. The application is therefore contrary to policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
2. The proposed development, as a result of the back land location of plots 2-4 along with their overall height and scale would be overly dominant in the surrounding area and would detract from and be out of keeping with the prevailing linear form of development along Romsey Road contrary to policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
3. The proposed dwelling on plot 2 of the proposed development due to its position adjacent to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at York House and the distance between this plot and York House would result in direct overlooking into the rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling at York House which would adversely affect the privacy of the occupiers contrary to policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

4. The proposed development, due to the layout of plots 2-4 to the rear of the site and due to the presence of off-site trees would not adequately provide for the privacy and amenity of future occupants and would not provide private open space that is appropriate for the needs of future occupiers contrary to policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
5. Plot 2 of the proposed development would be located in close proximity with off-site trees which contribute to the verdant character of the surrounding area. As a result of this close relationship, the trees would compromise the usability of the dwelling's small garden space along with the amount of daylight entering the dwelling. As a result, it is likely that there could be a pressure to fell these trees by future occupiers of plot 2. The loss of these trees would have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area. The application is therefore contrary to policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
6. Insufficient information has been submitted to enable the Local Planning Authority to determine whether the proposed development would be likely to have an impact on badgers. The application is therefore contrary to policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
7. The site lies within close proximity to the New Forest SPA which is designated for their 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 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Trees** – No objection subject to conditions.

5.2 **Highways** – No objection subject to conditions.

5.3 **Ecology** – No objection subject to conditions.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 19.01.2017

6.1 **Awbridge Parish Council** – Object on the following grounds (summarised):

- Proposals will largely have no material effect on several of the original reasons for objection.
- The Parish Council notes that some of its continuing reasons for objection are similar to those given by the planning authority in refusing the original application

Policy E1: High Quality Development in the Borough

- Felt proposals do not integrate, respect and complement the character in which the development is located due to layout and scale. Proposals would amount to over-development of the site in terms of density
- Number of proposed dwellings and their position does not respect the character of the surrounding area and neighbouring uses. The proposed layout, due to overlooking, will adversely affect immediate neighbours' enjoyment of their properties.

Policy E2: Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough

- Proposal will have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the immediate surrounding area and landscape character
- Concerns as to whether there are inadequate arrangements for the long-term management and maintenance of any existing and proposed landscaping, particularly along the west and east boundaries of the site.

Policy E7 – Flood Risk

- Concern with regards to the proposed drainage system, including soakaway, will be insufficient to manage ground and rain water run-off.

Policy LHW4

- Parish Council's view is that the development does not, due to overlooking, provide sufficiently for the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties. It is suggested that the proposed dwellings will reduce to below an acceptable level, the sunlight reaching some neighbouring properties or private open space.

Traffic generation

- The suggested traffic movements generated by the proposed development, including heavy vehicles servicing the site (refuse and sewerage) seems very low.

Communal package sewerage treatment plant

- There are understandable concerns, given residents' experience of a similar plant at the Springfield development, about future problems with the operation of the plant, including odours and accidental sewerage discharge.

6.2 **12 x Letters** objecting to the proposals on the following grounds (summarised):

General comments

- There are no real changes from the previously refused scheme.
- Do not agree with the Revised Local Plan which allows for development behind the lines of houses parallel to Romsey Road and Danes Road.

Character and appearance

- Proposals are over-development of the site – grossly overdevelops a fine proportioned house and garden and would squeeze four oversized houses on undersized plots.
- Would set a precedent for future back land development which would erode the character of the village.
- Out of character with the established ribbon layout.
- Lighting would have a huge effect on countryside setting
- Proposals would result in an extremely ugly development totally out of character with the surrounding area.
- Proposals more akin to something you would find in a more urban setting.

Ecology

- Site was stripped and barn demolished without regard to wildlife.
- Increase amount of noise, pollution and disruption generated by the proposal will continue to impact on wildlife.
- Do not understand how developers are allowed to cause such destruction and disfiguration of the land by spraying in the summer. This has been devastating to wildlife. Site is still looking very dead and desolate.
- Badger sett adjacent to the site – building cannot take place within at least 20 metres of the sett.
- Lighting would impact on nocturnal wildlife
- Slow worms would have almost certainly been on the site before clearance works were undertaken.

Residential amenity

- Development would result in unacceptable noise and vibration from building machinery.
- Proposed dwelling at the rear of the site would overlook directly into the surrounding neighbour's houses and garden and would impact on their privacy
- Development would result in the loss of privacy at Chanwell House, Chanwell House Anex, The Byre and York House.
- Proposal would result in light pollution
- Roadway along the length of the plot would create noise from traffic movements in the evening.
- Wembury would be closed in on all sides. Instead of rural ambiance, effectively be in the middle of a housing estate.

Highways

- Due to proximity of the school, there are many additional cars along Romsey Road during school drop off and pick up times. Creation of a new access would result in additional cars emerging onto the already busy Romsey Road and would increase congestion.
- Significant amount of cars associated with 4 bedroom houses. The amount of driveway does not look adequate.

Drainage

- Concern that the provision of drainage for the number of proposed houses will be inadequate
- More building would effect the water table of the area
- Risk of additional run-off down the hill is increased
- Concern about smell from the sewage treatment plant

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)

COM2 – Settlement hierarchy

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

LHW4 – Amenity

T1 – Managing movement

T2 – Parking standard

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Impact on residential amenities
- Highways
- Trees
- Ecology
- Drainage
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

8.2 **The principle of development**

The site is situated within the Awbridge settlement boundary as defined in the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 (RLP). As a result, provided the proposed development complies with the other relevant policies of the RLP, it would be acceptable in principle.

8.3 **Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

The site is located adjacent to Romsey Road and forms part of a linear character of this part of Awbridge. The immediate surrounding area includes detached dwellings facing the road situated in relatively large plots with large rear gardens. Dwellings in the immediate vicinity are a mixture of types and designs. There is no back land development within the immediate vicinity. The area is also verdant in its nature which adds to the overall rural character of the village.

- 8.4 The proposed development would result in the erection of a dwelling adjacent to the existing property at Banksia (plot 1). This dwelling would be located along the same building line as the existing built form along Romsey Road and would be of a scale and design that is in keeping with the existing dwelling. As a result, it is considered that plot 1 would be appropriate to the character of the surrounding area and would be in accordance with the relevant policies in the RLP.
- 8.5 With regards to plots 2-4 to the rear of the site, these dwellings are large, detached family homes. There were concerns in the previous application (16/02043/FULLS) with regards to the layout of these dwellings in addition to their backland location (reasons for refusal 1) and 2) repeated at paragraph 4.1 above). Concerns relating to plot sizes and the distances between the proposed dwellings resulted in the application being refused as being out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area contrary to policies E1 and E2 of the RLP.
- 8.6 Since the refusal of application 16/02043/FULLS, the applicant has sought to overcome the above reasons for refusal within this current submission. With regards to the design issues, the current application includes the following amendments from the scheme proposed under the previous application:
- Reduction in overall height of plots 2-4
 - Reduction and re-siting of plot 3 to allow for greater separation between it and plots 2 and 4.
 - Re-siting of Plot 2 to allow greater separation between it and York House along with allowing greater separation between it and the trees on boundary.
 - Re-arrangement of internal layout Plot 2
 - Double garage to plot 3 has been replaced by a single, attached garage
 - Re-siting of plot 3 has allowed for a bigger plot size/garden area for plot 4.
- 8.7 The plot sizes in the village vary, however, along Romsey Road, plot sizes are generally large. It is accepted that the plot sizes proposed in this current application are smaller than those seen in the immediate vicinity, however, the impact these smaller plots has on the area needs to be assessed alongside other design factors to understand whether the development as a whole would result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 8.8 It is considered that the re-siting and reduction in size of plot 3 has resulted in a layout that provides more space between the dwellings to the rear of the site. The re-siting has also enabled an increase in the size of the garden to plot 4 and has allowed some permeability when viewing the site from Romsey Road, for example, when viewing the site between Banksia and Plot 1 from Romsey Road the gap between plots 2 and 3 will be appreciated, thus resulting in a greater sense of space between the plots.

- 8.9 In combination with the layout changes, the overall height and roof massing of plots 2-4 has been reduced. The section drawings submitted by the applicant show that the amended plots 2 and 3 would not be the dominant buildings when viewing the site from Romsey Road. Plot 4 would be more visible from the access but would be set back from Romsey Road by approximately 85 metres and as such it is not considered that this would dominate views from the highway. It is considered that the current proposals to the rear of the site would be subservient to Banksia and Plot 1 which would remain the dominant buildings from Romsey Road. The proposals would maintain the strong linear form which is important in this part of Awbridge. In addition, whilst the plots of the proposed dwellings would be smaller than those in the immediate vicinity, due to the amended layout of plots 2-4 and the reduction of height of the dwellings, it is not considered that these smaller plot sizes would be seen in context with the surrounding development and as a result, it is not considered that these smaller plot sizes would result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 8.10 As a result of the above, it is considered that the proposals would not have any adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposals are considered to overcome the previous reasons for refusal (1) and (2)) and comply with policies E1 and E2 of the RLP.
- 8.11 **Impact on residential amenities**
It is considered that the proposed dwellings would have sufficient separation from the neighbouring dwellings at The Byre, Wembury, Hillsboro and Brockwood so that the proposals would not have any adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of these properties.
- 8.12 The previous application was refused on the grounds that the proposed development would result in harm to the amenities of the occupiers of York House and also to the amenities of the future occupiers of Plots 2-4. The impact the amended scheme would have on the amenities of these dwellings is discussed in the following paragraphs.
- 8.13 Impact on York House
The proposed dwelling on Plot 2 would be adjacent to the boundary with York House. Plot 2 would be positioned approximately 25 metres from the existing rear projection at York House and would thus not result in any adverse overlooking into the dwelling at York House itself. The previous application was however refused on the overlooking impact Plot 2 would have on the rear garden of York House, particularly considering that the first floor windows of Plot 2 would directly overlook a sensitive part of the rear garden of York House (reason for refusal (3)).
- 8.14 In attempt to overcome this matter, in addition to the re-siting of the dwelling (see para), the applicant has revised the first floor layout of Plot 2. Previously, Plot 2 included a bedroom window adjacent to the boundary, at first floor level which would have direct views towards the rear garden of York House. It was considered that as a result of the siting of the dwelling and the

position of the bedroom window adjacent to the boundary would, there would be adverse overlooking into the rear private garden of this neighbouring property.

- 8.15 The window directly adjacent to the boundary of York House would now serve an en-suite bathroom. As a result of the revised floor plan, with an en-suite window adjacent to the boundary, coupled with the revised layout of Plot 2 to give it greater separation between it and the boundary with York House, as the applicant has also proposed additional planting on the boundary (details to be secured by a condition) and as the positioning of the detached garage would help to screen views, it is not considered that this window would now result in any adverse overlooking into the rear garden of York House.
- 8.16 The other windows on the front elevation of Plot 2 would serve a landing and bedroom. These windows are positioned such that they would have oblique views of the rear of York House which would be interrupted by the positioning of the detached garage. As a result of this and considering the proposed separation between the dwellings, it is not considered that these windows would result in any adverse overlooking into the rear garden of York House.
- 8.17 As a consequence of the revised floor plan at Plot 2, a bedroom window will now be inserted at first floor level into the side elevation of this dwelling. This window would look out onto the rear area of garden belonging to York House. Whilst this window would look directly into the rear part of the neighbouring garden, there would be 4 metres separation between this window and the boundary and this window would be partially screened from the neighbouring garden by boundary vegetation. In addition, the window would look out onto a small area of the less sensitive rear part of the garden of York House, avoiding overlooking to the more private garden areas adjacent to the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. As a result, it is not considered that this window would have any adverse impacts in terms of overlooking on the residential amenities of the neighbouring dwelling at York House.
- 8.18 Loss of light
There are concerns from third parties that the proposed development would result in loss of light to the rear of their properties. It is considered that the separation distances between the dwelling and the neighbours would be such that the development would not result in any adverse loss of light which would impact on residential amenities.
- 8.19 Impact on the residential amenities of the proposed dwellings
Policy LHW4 of the RLP requires developments to have regard to the amenities of the occupiers of new residential developments. The previous application was refused on the grounds that the development would not adequately provide for the privacy and amenity of future occupiers due to both the layout of the development and the presence of off-site trees (reason for refusal (4)). The applicant has sought to overcome this with the revised layout. The impact the amended proposals would have on the amenities of future occupiers is considered in the following paragraphs.

8.20 Plot 2

Concerns with the previous application included the presence of off-site boundary trees, the relatively small area of garden provided to Plot 2 and the overbearing impact Plot 3 would have on this garden area. It was considered that the private garden would not have sufficient, useable garden space of the occupiers of Plot 2. In addition, it was considered that the garden would have an enclosed, oppressive environment which would have an adverse impact on future occupiers.

8.21 Since the previous application was determined, it is understood that some maintenance has been undertaken on the boundary trees where branches/vegetation overhanging the boundary into the site have been removed. In addition and more significantly, the applicant has reduced the size of the dwelling on Plot 3 and has re-sited it so that it sits further forward. As a result of the re-siting of Plot 3, it is not considered that this dwelling would now be unduly overbearing from the garden of Plot 2. Whilst the garden area of Plot 2 remains relatively small, it is now considered that this space would be much more useable for its future occupiers and would adequately provide for their privacy and amenities. It is now considered that the revised relationship between the two plots is acceptable.

8.22 Plot 3

The previous application was refused on the basis that Plot 3 would be significantly and adversely overlooked by plot 4 as a result of the proposed 15 metre separation distance which would not be sufficient to prevent mutual overlooking between the properties. It is considered that the re-siting of Plot 3 (as above) has overcome this issue. The separation between the two dwellings has increased to approximately 23 metres. This increase in separation, plus the position of Plot 4's detached garage would prevent overlooking that would adversely affect the amenities of the future residents of Plot 3.

8.23 Other amenity concerns

Concern has been raised with regards to the use of the proposed access to plots 2-4 and the impact this would have on the residential amenities of the adjacent occupier. It is not considered that the movement of cars associated with 3 dwellings would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring dwelling. With regards to larger vehicles such as a refuse truck and vehicles relating to the proposed sewage treatment plant, the movement of these types of vehicle would not be frequent enough (refuse vehicle 1-2 a week, vehicles relating to the treatment plant would be more infrequent) would not be such that they would result in a demonstrable adverse harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupier.

8.24 Summary

It is considered that the proposed development now presented would not have any adverse impacts on residential amenity that would substantiate a reason for refusal. The proposals are therefore considered to accord with policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

8.25 **Trees**

The application is supported by a survey, implications assessment and arboricultural method statement (EcoUrban 16767-AIA 19 August 2016). The report is considered by the Council's tree officer to present a fair reflection of trees present on the site, the impact to the trees present on the site, the impact to the trees as a result of the proposed development and presents appropriate solutions for the protection of trees to be retained during the course of construction. Provided the proposed development is undertaken in accordance with the recommendations within this report (secured by a condition), it is considered that the proposals would not result in any adverse harm to surrounding trees.

8.26 The submitted plans include the provision for replacement tree planting. Additional details will be required in relation to this. Such information can be required by an appropriate condition added to any permission.

8.27 Notwithstanding the above, during the previous application, Officers considered that the proposals would create a pressure to fell trees on the boundary between Plot 2 and Hillsboro contrary to policy E2 of the RLP (reason for refusal (5)) on the basis that the trees would compromise the usability of Plot 2's small garden area and the amount of light entering the dwelling.

8.28 It is noted that some of this boundary vegetation has since been cut back, however, more significantly, the dwelling at Plot 3 has been re-sited such that it no longer has an undue overbearing impact on Plot 2. It is considered the re-siting of Plot 3 has resulted in Plot 2 having a much more useable garden space that would take pressure off the boundary trees. As such, subject to a condition requiring tree protection during construction (as above), the proposals would not have any adverse impacts on surrounding trees. The application is therefore considered to comply with policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

8.29 **Highways**

Parking

The proposed dwellings would be provided with off-street parking in accordance with the parking standards set out in the RLP. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy T2.

8.30 Impact on the highway network

The applicant has provided plans which show adequate visibility can be provided in both directions to allow safe egress from the site.

8.31 The application is supported by a Transport Statement which concludes that the proposed development can be safely accommodated by the existing highway network and that the envisaged increase in traffic (one movement every 20 minutes during peak times) would not have any adverse impacts on the operation and capacity of the highway network or adjacent junctions.

The LPA have no evidence to disagree with this conclusion. The highways officer was consulted on the proposals and has confirmed no objections subject to a number of conditions relating to the provision of visibility splays, gates and the provision of a non-migratory material. Provided these conditions are added to any permission, it is considered that the proposals would be in accordance with policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

8.32 **Ecology**

International sites

The proposed development would result in a net increase in residential dwellings within 13.06km of the New Forest SPA. This distance defines the zone identified by recent research where new residents would be considered likely to visit these sites. This SPA supports a range of bird species that are vulnerable to impacts arising from increases in recreational use of the sites that result from new housing development. It has been demonstrated through research, and agreed by Natural England that any net increase would have a likely significant effect on the SPA when considered in combination with other plans and projects.

8.33 To address the above issue, the Local Planning Authority has adopted a strategy whereby a scale of developer contributions has been agreed that would fund the delivery of measures to address these issues. With respect to the New Forest, a new strategic area of alternative recreational open space is being delivered that would offer the same sort of recreational opportunities as those offered by the New Forest.

8.34 The proposed development would have a likely significant impact on the New Forest SPA. A legal agreement to provide mitigation for this impact to secure a financial contribution towards and alternative recreational open space is being progressed. An update with regards to this will be provided in the update paper.

8.35 On-site ecology

The application is supported by an Ecological Appraisal and phase 1 and 2 bat surveys (Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services April 2016, updated August and November 2016 and January 2017).

8.36 The site has been subject to significant clearance before the submission of this application and outside the control of the Local Planning Authority. As a result, much of the vegetation and buildings that had ecological value have been removed from the site. The ecology report submitted with the application concludes that the cleared site is considered to be of low ecological value. It is regrettable that the site, which could have been of higher ecological value, has been cleared. The clearance of the site without regard to ecology may have been in contravention with the relevant habitat law, however, for the purposes of determining this application, the Local Planning Authority can only consider the impacts the proposed development would have on the site as it exists.

8.37 The ecology report suggests some recommendations to enhance the biodiversity of the site. It is considered that a more comprehensive strategy to improve the current level of biodiversity provision within the development is required. Such a strategy can be sought by an appropriate condition on any permission.

8.38 **Badgers**

A badger sett has been identified close to the site. This sett has been classified as a possible main breeding sett and is therefore the central point for a family group of badgers.

8.39 With the sett being outside of the site, it is proposed to be retained. The sett will be disturbed by the development and as such, the relevant licence from Natural England will be required. The proposed development, if unmitigated, would cause disturbance to the sett through noise and vibration, and the proposals would also result in the loss of foraging habitat.

8.40 The application is supported by an Ecological Appraisal which includes a methodology which would be applied during the construction phase to avoid harm to badgers. After the construction period, it is proposed to install badger proof fencing to prevent damage to gardens by foraging badgers or disturbance of the sett by future occupiers.

8.41 The mitigation proposed by the applicant is considered appropriate and can be secured by a condition. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in harm to this protected species.

8.42 **Drainage**

Concern has been raised with regards to the adequacy of the proposed drainage of the site (provided by a packaged sewage treatment plant). Local residents have experienced drainage issues with earlier developments in the area. It is noted that the site is in flood zone 1 and as such is in an area where development is considered appropriate in flooding terms. With regards to drainage, the village does not have mains foul drainage and as such, a non mains system has to be used. Package sewage treatment plants are generally an appropriate system to be used in residential developments and its installation will be overseen by the Building Control Regulations. Notwithstanding this, as a result of previous issues relating to poor drainage in the vicinity, a condition can be added to any permission requiring full details of the drainage system to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the system proposed is adequate for the site and for the development.

8.43 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

The Council has commenced charging the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Council will be charging CIL liable development which is retail development over 280 square metres, residential development over 100 square metres and all new residential dwellings, if granted planning

permission on or after the 1 August 2016. Self-build and affordable housing is exempt from paying CIL, provided the relevant criteria for exemption as set out in the CIL Regulations can be demonstrated. The Council's Charging Schedule sets out the CIL rates.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle, and, subject to conditions would not result in adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, residential amenities, trees, highways or ecology. The proposals are considered to comply with the relevant policies contained within the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

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. **No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out 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 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.
3. **Prior to the commencement of development the access shall be constructed with the visibility splays of 2.4 by 43 metres and maintained as such at all times. Within these visibility splays notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no obstacles, including walls, fences and vegetation, shall exceed the height of 1 metre above the level of the existing carriageway at any time.**
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
4. **Any gates shall be set back at least 5 metres from the edge of the carriageway of the adjoining highway and the access shall be splayed at an angle of 45 degrees from this point to the edge of the highway.**
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
5. **At least the first 5 metres of the access track measured from the nearside edge of carriageway of the adjacent highway shall be surfaced in a non-migratory material prior to the use of the access commencing and retained as such at all times.**
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.

- 6. The development shall not be occupied until space has been laid out and provided for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles to enable them to enter and leave the site in a forward gear in accordance with the approved plan and this space shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.**
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
- 7. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out within the Eco Urban Ltd Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement reference 16767-AIA dated 19 August 2016.**
Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 8. Tree protective measures installed (in accordance with the tree protection condition above) shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or until such time as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities, nor material storage, nor placement of site huts or other equipment whatsoever shall take place within the barrier.**
Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 9. All service routes, drain runs, soakaways or excavations in connection with the development hereby permitted shall remain wholly outside the tree protective barrier.**
Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 10. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until full details of hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include-where appropriate: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.**
Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme and in accordance with the management plan.

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 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.

- 11. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until a schedule of landscape management and maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas and an implementation programme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by proper maintenance of existing and new landscape features as an improvement of the appearance of the site and to enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.

- 12. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the submitted 'Ecological Appraisal & Phase 1 and 2 Bat Surveys' report (Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services April 2016 updated August and November 2016 and January 2017) specifically the conclusions and recommendations set out in section 5.0.**

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity and protected species in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E5.

- 13. Before the development of the dwellings hereby permitted reaches damp proof course level, details of biodiversity enhancements to be incorporated into the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with any such approved details.**

Reason: To enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 14. 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.**

- 15. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers [Insert drawing numbers]
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning."**

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 21 February 2017

APPLICATION NO.	16/03181/FULLS
SITE	Banksia , Romsey Road, Awbridge, SO51 0HG, AWBRIDGE
COMMITTEE DATE	21 February 2017
ITEM NO.	11
PAGE NO.	101 - 133

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 A viewing panel was held on Friday 17 February 2017. Members who attended were Councillors Adams-King, Bailey, Bundy, Cooper, Hurst, Johnston and Richards.

2.0 **ADDITIONAL PLAN**

2.1 An additional plan comparing the layout of the refused scheme and the layout of the current scheme is included as part of this update.

3.0 **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **2 x additional letters** objecting to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- The Byre will be overlooked by plots 3, 4 and 5 – not happy about plot 3 as it will have direct views into garden and rear of house at The Byre.
- Building process will result in an unacceptable level of noise and traffic. This will affect the peace of the area.
- Character of the area will be radically changed – wildlife will no longer be able to inhabit the land. Ecological survey has failed to state that there is a Badger Sett adjacent to the site.
- Increase in traffic will be unacceptable and have an impact on Romsey Road which is already dangerous.
- Proposals would result in over-development of the site.
- Proposals will result in overlooking into neighbouring dwellings.
- The house at Banksia is at risk of being lost, we would lose another piece of history from the village.
- Concern over increased surface water and lack of drainage that will inevitably occur.

4.0 **AMENDMENTS FROM REFUSED APPLICATION**

4.1 Paragraph 8.6 of the agenda report details the amendments to the scheme since the original application (16/02043/FULLS) was refused. Further information with regards to these amendments are included below.

4.2 Reduction in overall height of plots 2-4

The approximate ridge height of plots 2-4 proposed in the refused scheme

was **9.2 metres** (approximately). The approximate ridge heights of plots 2-4 are now proposed to be **8.4 metres** a reduction of approximately **0.8 metres**.

4.3 Reduction and re-siting of plot 3 to allow for greater separation between it and plots 2 and 4

Please note that the below are approximate measurements scaled from the submitted plans.

Distance between plot 3 and boundary with plot 2 – Refused Scheme	0.5 metres
Distance between plot 3 and boundary with plot 2 – Current Scheme	2 metres
Distance between rear of plot 3 and front of plot 4- Refused Scheme	15 metres
Distance between rear of plot 3 and front of plot 4 – Current Scheme	23 metres

4.4 Re-siting of plot 2 to allow greater separation between it and York House along with greater separation between it and trees on the boundary

Distance between side elevation of plot 2 and boundary with York House (Refused Scheme)	3 metres
Distance between side elevation of plot 2 and boundary with York House (Current Scheme)	5 metres

5.0 **LEGAL AGREEMENT UPDATE**

5.1 Paragraphs 8.32-8.34 of the agenda report confirm that a financial contribution towards the New Forest SPA is required in relation to the proposed development and likely harm it would have on this international site. A legal agreement to secure the required contribution was completed on 14 February 2017.

6.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

Recommendation as per the agenda report with amended condition 15:

15. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers:

D01 – Site Plan as Proposed

7210/2/D02 – Plot 1 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D03 – Plot 2 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D04 – Plot 3 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D05 – Plot 4 – Proposed Floor Plans

7210/2/D06 – Plot 1 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D07 – Plot 2 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D08 – Plot 3 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D09 – Plot 4 – Proposed Elevations

7210/2/D11 – Garage Floor Plans and Elevations

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

