

7. **18/01391/FULLS (PERMISSION) 01.06.208** **10 – 25**
SITE: Land known as AP6 Adanac Park (North and East of Hotel), Adanac Drive, Nursling, **NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS**
CASE OFFICER: Paul Goodman
8. **18/02058/FULLS (PERMISSION) 10.08.2018** **26 – 50**
SITE: Land adjacent to 5 Riverside Green, **KING'S SOMBORNE**
CASE OFFICER: Sarah Appleton
9. **18/01437/FULLS (PERMISSION) 07.06.2018** **51 – 73**
SITE: Starlings, Whinwhistle Road, East Wellow, **WELLOW**
CASE OFFICER: Sarah Barter

APPLICATION NO.	18/01391/FULLS
SITE	Land Known As AP6 Adanac Park (North And East Of Hotel), Adanac Drive, Nursling, SO16 0AT, NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS
COMMITTEE DATE	18 th September 2018
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	10 - 25

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Additional representations and consultations have been received as detailed below. As a result the recommendation has been amended.

2.0 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 **HCC Lead Flood Authority** – No objection, subject to condition.

2.2 **HCC Highways** – No objection, subject to conditions.

3.0 REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 **2 representations of Objection received from 14 Gover Road, Southampton and 18 Tate Mews, Tate Road, Southampton;**

- Cumulative impact of planned developments in the Adanac Park area including Lidl Superstore, nursing home, business units etc.
- Park and ride is a great proposal but the local infrastructure is not adequate to deal with the traffic.
- Proposal will ease congestion at the hospital but create further problems at the Adanac Park roundabout and M271.
- Further queuing problems along Brownhill Way in both directions.

4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 **Flooding & Drainage**

HCC as the Lead Flood Authority requested the submission of further details relating to the surface water drainage at the site. The applicants have subsequently submitted a surface water drainage strategy for the UHS Temporary Car Park and LFA have confirmed no objection to the proposals. An addition condition is recommended to secure development in accordance with the agreed details. As a result it is no longer necessary to delegate the matter to the Head of Planning and Building and the recommendation has been amended accordingly.

4.2 **Highways**

HCC Highways have raised no objection, subject to a number of conditions to control specific elements of the development discussed further below. A copy of the HCC Highways advice is provided for member's information at Appendix A.

4.3 **Overnight Parking**

As identified in the HCC Highways response the submitted staff surveys indicate that a high number of shifts finish in the period of 07:00 – 09:00. However, the proposed vehicular trip generation in the TA states that 0

vehicles will leave the site in either the standard or network AM Peaks. It has been confirmed that there will be no overnight parking at the park and ride facility and therefore no vehicles leaving the site at this time. As such movements are not included in the trip calculations it is necessary to restrict overnight use of the facility by condition.

4.4 Trip Generation

The HCC response confirms that the proposed temporary park & ride is forecast to generate fewer trips between 08:00 – 09:00 than the extant AP6 permission for B1 use. However, during the ‘network peak’ of 07:30 – 08:30 there are substantially more trips generated by the proposed site than in the 0800-0900 peak hour.

4.5 The trip generation of the extant B1a use during the period 07:30 – 08:30 has been considered and compared to the trip generation of the proposed park and ride, minus the existing vehicular trips already on the network travelling to existing hospital parking HCC have confirmed that the park and ride will have a lower net trip generation than the extant permission but have further recommended a condition requiring that the development does not generate more than the peak traffic period staff trips presented in the Transport Assessment.

4.6 However it is not considered that such a condition is necessary or enforceable. The site is to be restricted to use by the Hospital Trust for staff and controlled by a permit system. There is no reason to assume that shift patterns would alter dramatically and affect the movements to and from the site. The condition is not therefore considered to be necessary. In addition the forecast trip generation for the use is based on TRICs survey data and forecasts average trip generation. Enforcement of such a restriction would be unrealistically onerous on the local authority.

4.7 Internal Site Layout

The HCC comments have sought to secure by condition details tracking for buses within the site and details of any new shelters. However the application proposes the use of the existing bus shelter on Adanac Drive and as a result the buses will not enter the site. The specific parking spaces are required to be to the required standard at 2.4 x 4.8m with isle widths of 6m. It was noted that no disabled bays are proposed. However the Trust has subsequently confirmed that disabled staff benefit from guaranteed parking at the hospital site. A condition requiring that the individual spaces and isles meet the required standard is recommended.

4.8 Bus Service

The HCC response has identified that, with car sharing considered, there could be 600+ people requiring bus travel to the University Hospital Southampton site in one hour in the AM. A bus service to accommodate the demand is clearly required by the Trust to operate the site. However the proposed condition seeks to require the approval of the details of the service provider which is not considered to be reasonable. The Trust have confirmed that a procurement process is underway for the provision of the bus service and it is considered that a condition requiring its provision prior to the first use of the site is justified approval of the service provider is not.

4.9 Construction Traffic Management Plan
Provision of a Construction Management Plan prior to the commencement of development is considered appropriate and a condition added to the recommendation.

4.10 **Other Conditions**
The conditions in the Officers recommendation have been further amended to improve their precision.

5.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes:

1. **The use hereby permitted shall cease on or before 31st December 2022 and the land restored in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to an approved by the Local Planning Authority. The restoration scheme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority a minimum of three months prior to the cessation of the approved use.**

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can exercise control in the locality in the interest of employment land protection and delivery of medical services at the University Hospital Trust site in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 policy LE6.

2. **The use hereby permitted shall be restricted to park and ride facilities for staff employed by University Hospital Southampton NHS Trust, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order that car parking use is not established beyond any identified need and since the development would be permitted as an exception to development plan policy only on the basis of an identified need, which is specific in nature and time limited in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan Policy LE6.

3. **Prior to the laying of the final wearing course of the development hereby permitted full details of hard and soft landscape works shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, etc.) Soft landscape works to provide additional planting on the eastern boundary with Adanac Drive 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 approved details, implementation programme and 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.

- 4. The proposed Park & Ride car park shall not be brought into use until a permit system restricting the use of the site for staff employed by University Hospital Southampton NHS Trust, for both the users of the car park and the bus service, has been implemented.**
Reason: to minimize any potential impact to the Strategic Road Network (SRN), the M271 in accordance with Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
- 5. The use hereby permitted shall be restricted to the hours between 06:00 and 22:00. No overnight parking shall take place unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
Reason: In order that use does not result in additional vehicular trips that have not been assessed or mitigated in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan Policy T1.
- 6. The park and ride facility shall not be brought into use until the park and ride bus has been provided. The bus service shall be maintained for the duration of the park and ride operation.**
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan Policy T1.
- 7. The individual parking spaces hereby permitted shall measure a minimum of 2.4 by 4.8m. Parking aisle widths shall measure a minimum of 6.0m in width. The park and ride bus service shall not enter the site unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan Policies T1 and T2.
- 8. Prior to the commencement of development a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall include; construction traffic routes, parking and turning provision to be made on site and measures to prevent mud from being deposited on the highway. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.**
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan Policy T1.
- 9. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum & Drainage Strategy UHS-ONE-ZZ-ZZ-RP-C-0001 (P01) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and in the interest of local amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E7.



Hampshire County Council

*Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD*

Tel: 0845 603 5638 (General Enquiries)
0845 603 5633 (Roads and Transport)
0845 603 5634 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0845 603 5625
Fax 01962 847055
www.hants.gov.uk

Head of Planning Services
Test Valley Borough Council
Beech Hurst
Weyhill Road
ANDOVER
Hampshire
SP10 3AJ

<i>Enquiries to</i>	Fraser Spinney	<i>My reference</i>	6/3/4/30
<i>Direct Line</i>	01962 845103	<i>Your reference</i>	18/01391/FULLS
<i>Date</i>	4th September 2018	<i>Email</i>	Fraser.spinney@hants.gov.uk

For the attention of Paul Goodman

Dear Sir,

Temporary park and ride facility for University Hospital Southampton (UHS) which will provide up to 1,010 staff car parking spaces for a period of 4 years. Land known as AP6 Adanac Park (North and East of Hotel), Adanac Drive, Nursling, Hampshire SO16 0AT.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the above application. The application is for a temporary park and ride service to serve staff of the University Hospital Southampton (UHS) for a period of 4 years.

It is understood the site currently has an existing outline planning permission for 20,583sqm of employment floorspace (B1), together with associated works including drainage, vehicular accesses, realigned access to the adjacent Holiday Inn Hotel, car parking and landscaping which was granted in 2014 (14/00141/OUTS). It is understood that this extant use for the site will come forward after the 4 year period has expired and not in conjunction with the temporary park and ride. No scenario has been presented where the extant land use and temporary park and ride come forward simultaneously and therefore the impact or acceptability of the scenario has not been reviewed or demonstrated as acceptable. The comments below are in relation to the temporary park and ride facility only.

It is noted that the planning application states that the application is for up to 1,010 staff car parking spaces for a period of four years whereas the Transport Assessment states that it is for 1050 spaces. On the basis that parking permits are to be allocated centrally via UHS and accounting for staff leave and sickness etc., this difference is not considered material.

*Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI*

Call charges apply. For information see www.hants.gov.uk

AP6 TEMP PR RESPONSE 3RD

Walking and Cycling

The site has good pedestrian and cycle links whereby cycling from the site provides an attractive mode of travel to Lordshill, Maybush, Nursling and a number of local amenities. The shared foot/cycleway links the site to the junction of Brownhill Way, where cyclists can continue into Southampton via Lower Brownhill Road. There is a continuous footway measuring 2.5m which binds the site frontage to the east that extends onto Brownhill Way and is supported by crossing points with tactile paving and dropped kerbs. There is also a footway which periodically bounds the western side of the road linking to the site which allows safe access to and from the site.

Public Transport

In the Transport Assessment (TA) it states that a bus stop is situated three minutes from Adanac Drive and the bus stop is served by the number '1' bus serving Southampton City Centre. However, First Bus '1' is no longer an active service and therefore cannot be considered as public transport available to the site. The nearest existing public transport option is the Bluestar service 17, with stops on Lower Brownhill Road, approximately a 10 minute walk from the site. However, it is proposed the park and ride facility will commission a bus service directly serving the hospital and this is discussed further below.

Park and Ride Bus Service Operation

The TA describes how UHS is exploring options for a bus service to serve the park and ride. With car sharing considered, there could be 600+ people requiring bus travel to the University Hospital Southampton site in one hour in the AM. It needs to be demonstrated that a bus service could accommodate this forecast demand combined with any current patronage on the route so that the feasibility and acceptability of this can be assessed.

Should the application be granted permission, a condition should be included which requires the applicant to agree the bus service level prior to occupation of the site to ensure that demand is appropriately met.

Parking and Internal Layout

Internal Layout

The general layout of the proposed site appears reasonable given the information provided, with adequately sized vehicle parking bays at 2.4 x 4.8m. However, whilst it may be a scaling issue, the associated aisle width appears to be below the required 6.0m which could make it difficult to turn in and out of the parking spaces. These should be reviewed across the site as a whole to ensure that an appropriate width is provided.

Vehicle Tracking

Additionally, no vehicle tracking has been submitted, in particular for the P&R buses themselves, and as such, it has not been possible to ascertain whether adequate space has been afforded for the bus to move easily around site or

indeed through the proposed barriers at the access/egress. It would therefore be requested that tracking be provided, and that this replicate the intended route of the P&R bus through the actual site.

Shelters/Pick-up Points

It is also noted that no shelter locations or details are shown on plans. These will be required.

Parking

As outlined above, the specific parking spaces appear to be to the required standard at 2.4 x 4.8m, however it is noted that there are no disabled bays proposed. Whilst this may be due to alternatives such as guaranteed disabled parking at the hospital, it would be requested that this be confirmed to be the case. If this is incorrect, then it is requested that the applicants review the potential need for disabled parking at the P&R, and provide it accordingly on revised plans. A standard would be a 5% provision, however if the applicants have a more site specific and justifiable figure, if details can be provided they will be reviewed accordingly.

There is also a lack of cycle parking on-site, which would be welcomed as it gives the opportunity for users to part cycle and part P&R bus to site, particularly if secure bicycle lockers are provided in addition to sheltered Sheffield stands. Again, if it is reviewed by the applicants, with an appropriate provision added to revised plans, this would be welcomed.

The outstanding internal matters mentioned above can be conditioned and the internal layout finalised prior to commencement of the development.

Trip Generation

The TA explains that the proposed temporary park & ride is forecast to generate fewer trips between 08:00 – 09:00 than the extant AP6 permission for B1 use. However, during the 'network peak' of 07:30 – 08:30 there are substantially more trips generated by the proposed site than in the 0800-0900 peak hour.

To assess the acceptability of this, the trip generation of the extant B1a use during the period 07:30 – 08:30 has been considered and compared to the trip generation of the proposed park and ride, minus the existing vehicular trips already on the network travelling to existing hospital parking. It is considered that the park and ride will have a lower net trip generation than the extant permission. The forecast trip generation for the extant B1 use is based on TRICs survey data and forecasts the average trip generation for the site.

Further to this, the staff surveys displayed in Appendix C show that a high number of shifts finish in the period of 07:00 – 09:00. However, the proposed vehicular trip generation in the TA states that 0 vehicles will leave the site in either the standard or network AM Peaks. Also, Appendix C has given no figures for the number of vehicle departures. It has been confirmed that there

will be no overnight parking at the park and ride facility and therefore no vehicles leaving the site.

The highway authority accepts the forecast traffic generation and does not require any further investigation or mitigation, predicated on planning conditions ensuring no overnight parking and restricting peak period trips through shift patterns to no more than those set out in the TA being included within the permission.

Highway Safety

The Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data provided in the Transport Assessment shows that a total of three accidents have occurred on Hampshire's highway network in the most recently available five year period. Two of these incidents occurred on Brownhill Way between the M271 Junction 1 roundabout and the Adanac roundabout, although both of these accidents occurred prior to the current configuration of the stretch of road.

One accident has occurred since the improvements to the roundabout and while all accidents are regretful this does not indicate a pattern of accidents in this location.

Recommendation

The highway authority raises no objection to this application subject to suitably worded conditions securing the following:

- Overnight parking at the temporary park and ride facility shall not occur as no outbound AM peak period vehicular trips have been presented, assessed or mitigated.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
- The development must not exceed the peak traffic period staff trips presented in the Transport Assessment. Staff shift patterns must be provided to the Local Planning Authority on request.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
- The development shall not be occupied until the park and ride bus service provision has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed bus service shall be maintained for the duration of the park and ride operation.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
- The development shall not commence until plans and particulars showing the detailed proposals for the the internal site layout, including parking aisle widths, vehicle tracking of park and ride buses, shelter locations, disabled parking bays and provision of cycle parking has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the

approved details.

Reason: In the interests of site accessibility.

- A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority in writing before development commences. This should include; construction traffic routes, parking and turning provision to be made on site, measures to prevent mud from being deposited on the highway and a programme for construction. The agreed details shall be fully implemented before the development is commenced.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

I trust that the above is clear, however, should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Fraser Spinney on 01962 845103.

Yours sincerely

Stuart Morton
Transport Team Leader - Highways Development Planning

APPLICATION NO.	18/02058/FULLS
SITE	Land Adj. 5 Riverside Green, Kings Somborne, Stockbridge, SO20 6NG, KINGS SOMBORNE
COMMITTEE DATE	18 th September 2018
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	26 - 50

1.0 REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 Paragraph 6.6 of the agenda report confirmed that at the time of writing, the publicity period in relation to the application had not lapsed. The following additional representations have been received.

1.2 **Kings Somborne Parish Council** – Comment:

“as before serious concerns were expressed by local residents and endorsed by committee members. Queries remained on the question of land ownership and the covenant, protection of trees and their roots, the restricted access and turning points adjacent to the plot. One committee member objected to the plan on the grounds of over development of this particular area of land and the other 3 wished their serious concerns to be recorded.”

1.3 **13 x additional letters of objection** raising the following, additional concerns (concerns that were not summarised in the agenda report):

Highways

- Part of the land is highway land – this has implications for the provision and retention of adequate parking. It is impossible to park a vehicle where it is indicated to park one.
- No turning space is to be provided within the site contrary to policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
- Increasing parking problems in Riverside Green have resulted in access problems for emergency vehicles.
- Waiting for large vehicles to manoeuvre can take ages.
- Brick wall to number 5 Riverside Green has been drawn incorrectly – it indicates the splay in the wall in the wrong place.
- Pedestrian safety would be compromised.
- Lane outside of the site is public highway and not, as previously claimed, private lane.
- Previous planning inspector found in favour of TVBC and clearly stated that the increase use of this narrow lane would be detrimental to highway safety. This application would further increase the risks to road safety.
- Assumed that standard conditions will be applied to the application including appropriate space for the cleaning off of vehicles etc. in accordance with the Highways Act 1980. The site is so small, this requirement would be impossible to facilitate. What measures are TVBC intending to put in place through a planning condition to manage and monitor this aspect to ensure neighbouring road surfaces are not left coated with mud.
- Construction traffic would have major implications for highway safety in

- Riverside Green including pedestrian safety.
- Proposed site is at a pinch point in the access drive to the residents of 15 Riverside Green on a 'blind' corner where you cannot see cars or pedestrians accessing the properties of 7-17 Riverside Green and poses serious safety concerns.
- The need for an accurate plan is critical, especially in view of the highway concerns which have been expressed.
- Existing track is frequently congested and is completely inadequate for the number of vehicles generated by the existing development.
- Any car larger than a standard saloon would take up both parking spaces.

1.4 Design/impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area/Conservation Area

- Re-submitted plans show dwelling with a much increased roof level so with a slightly smaller footprint it was still increased in volume.
- Proposed house is far too large for the plot and as a result, is forced into facing the wrong direction.
- The cypresses has been used extensively to mark a natural break between the two halves of Riverside Green. All residents have endeavoured to keep the 'Conservation' feel about the estate. The trees form part of the character of the area and provide a good privacy screen.
- The site has received zero maintenance and is an eyesore and as such has a negative affect on what is otherwise a pretty area.
- Proposal is an attempt to shoe-horn a dwelling into an estate which is already well-established in character.
- Concern on the welfare of trees surrounding the site.
- There are no gables of a similar size to that proposed on any other property at Riverside Green. The gables referred to in the Officer's report are small and part of window treatments.
- Contrary to the Officer's report, the dwelling is not sited centrally within the plot. The dwelling is located immediately alongside the west boundary, clearly marked on the plan as 0.8 metres from the fence line. It has its longest elevation directly facing numbers 11 and 15, who are most directly affected by the scheme. The house is clearly sited on one side of the plot.
- Roof structure of the proposed dwelling would be out of keeping with the existing character in Riverside Green.
- Dormer structure attached to the roof serves no design purpose. This carbuncle would be seen by occupiers of 5 Riverside Green where it would be a dominant structure.
- Plot is so small that there is no possibility of planting replacement trees.
- Proposals would detract from the character of the conservation area and certainly will not enhance it, particularly with the loss of surrounding trees.
- Recently approved planning for the adjacent site sits within a much larger plot and is in keeping with the surrounding properties in the Riverside Green conservation area.
- Proposed dwelling is now far higher than neighbouring properties and is completely out of scale.
- Hedgerow along the boundary is classified as an important hedgerow and is also protected.
- Local Neighbourhood Development Plan is keen to promote good design.

Good design includes matters of siting, layout and compatibility with surroundings as well as the architecture of the building. Cannot therefore understand why there is no objection to the proposal.

- Loss of vegetation on the site compounds the detrimental effect that the proposal would have on the character of the area.
- In an attempt to avoid overlooking of existing properties, proposal would have a single aspect to the east, indicative of a very non-energy efficient design.

1.5 Impact on residential amenities

- In the short term, cannot see how the house can be built without significant disruption to the residents of numbers 7, 9, 11 and 15.
- Development needs to be suitable for the needs of any future residents – the garden space is very small with a lot of space being taken up by parking.
- Proposal would result in a degree of overlooking of neighbouring properties leading to intrusion.
- Proposal would result in complete exposure of neighbouring properties (11 and 15) to the 7.9m western elevation of the proposed dwelling, complete with windows. Although it is proposed to have these ‘top hung’ the psychological effect will be that there are windows looking directly at numbers 11 and 15 less than 14 metres away. This does not accord with best practice.
- Proposal would result in considerable overlooking into the garden of number 24 Riverside Green. The presence of the garages makes it no less an infringement on the privacy of those in number 24.
- Size of the plot means that there will always be conflicts of privacy and overlooking .
- Application from 2007 was withdrawn following a recommendation for refusal. The Case Officer in this instance considered that the proposals would not leave adequate amenity space – the amenity space proposed at the time was significantly greater than the now proposed – not aware of any changes in TVBC policy concerning this since 2007. Do not understand the shift in requirement of amenity space area.
- Proposed amenity space would not be adequate/useable due to the size and proposed slope. There would be no flat area for seating.
- Having measured the distance between the front elevation of 11 Riverside Green to the proposed rear elevation of the applicant’s house it is 13.4 metres, not 14 metres as stated in the officer report. The close proximity of the proposal would be very intimidating, especially if the conifer screen were to be removed.
- Single aspect to the east would result in inadequate levels of sunlight for the occupants.
- Proposed dwelling would dominate views from 5 Riverside Green.

1.6 Land ownership

- Surely it is incumbent on the Council, especially as they sold this land, to ensure the issue of land ownership is resolved at an early stage rather than the Planning Dept. closing their eyes to the issues resulting in costly legal actions in the future involving TVBC if it is shown that they drafted the plans incorrectly.

- If planning permission is granted, the existence of an unresolved ownership dispute can be anything from severely disruptive to catastrophic, and can involve a considerable amount of time and legal costs, which is not of benefit to either party. Surely the Council should be initiating some liaison between the parties to at least establish whether there are irreconcilable differences?

1.7 Policy considerations

- Application would be contrary to policy SD1 – there would be no environmental, economic or social benefits.
- E1 – Application is contrary to paras. 7.5,7.7,7.10,7.11 and 7.16 of Policy E1.
- E2 – Application is contrary to paras. 7.18, 7.21, 7.22 and 7.23 of Policy E2.
- LHW4 – Application is contrary to paras. 8.19, 8.20 and 8.21 of Policy LHW4.
- T1 – Application is contrary to paras. 9.11.
- T2 – There is only parking for one vehicle. Parking provision is poorly laid out and is not practical.

1.8 Previous appeal decision

- Highway conditions have clearly worsened since the Inspector's decision.
- Officer report does not reflect the findings of the Inspector's deliberations on this matter and are based on a misunderstanding of the Inspector's Report.
- The Inspector clearly considered only the amenity effects on nos 11 and 15, but the case officer has misunderstood this to suggest that the Inspector's highway objections relate only to the impact on these two properties and not to anything to the east, whereas the contrary is true.

1.9 General comments

- The land should be used as it was intended where plant and animal life could flourish reflecting and enhancing the bio-diversity within Kings Somborne and the surrounding area.
- Plans which are known to be inaccurate give members of the public no confidence that the proposal is understood or has been assessed properly.
- An additional shortcoming in the block plan is that it fails to show at all the disposition of some adjacent, relevant features and the public footpath to the north of the site. Surely accurate plotting of these features at a measureable scale should be a basic requirement of the block plan.
- Application is for a market dwelling.
- Proposal is not a starter home as described by the applicant.

1.10 **16 x letters of support summarised as follows:**

- Proposal would complete the look of the Close and will be more pleasing to the eye than what is already there.
- This proposal will make an affordable home for a young family which is important with the current housing situation.
- Application is being made by a young professional couple who wish to bring up their family and add to the community in a positive manner. The

couple wish their child and future children to grow up in this type of community and would attend the village school.

- Applicants have bent over backwards to try and accommodate as many as the residents concerns as possible whilst trying to achieve a property that meets their needs.
- The proposed property includes 2 parking spaces.
- Occupiers would support local community facilities.
- Proposals do support the Neighbourhood plan and government planning policy and would provide a family home.
- Currently a much larger property being constructed on the plot behind and if this proposal is supported, it allows a balance in the sizing of houses in Riverside Green.
- Should not be limiting villages to those who cannot afford a 3 bedroom or bigger home.
- The applicant is not wanting to develop the site for financial gain – only to provide a home for his family.
- Applicant and his family are currently living in one room, which is not satisfactory.
- Considering there is a much larger dwelling being built behind the proposed site, the traffic would not be sufficiently worse.
- Issues surrounding overlooking and keeping with the type of dwellings seems irrelevant, given that there are several other properties which overlook another property from somewhere within.
- Considering the several different appearances of other properties, I fail to understand how this would look out of place.
- All builds will cause a certain amount of unrest within a community, however this is short term and anyone would do the utmost to please neighbours while works are in progress.

2.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

2.1 Much of the additional concerns raised by the above representations are covered in the agenda report. The following are additional comments on any matters that have not been previously covered.

2.2 **Accuracy of plans**

Officers have discussed the concerns raised in relation to the accuracy of the submitted plans, particularly the block plan with the applicant's agent who has confirmed that they are satisfied that the submitted plans accurately reflect the position on site. In addition, officers have compared the submitted block plan with a highway plan provided by Hampshire County Council and are satisfied that the submitted block plan accurately reflects the position of the highway shown on the Hampshire County Council plan.

2.3 Plot sizes

The following table shows the plot sizes of dwellings in the vicinity of the site. The following are the plots immediately surrounding the dwellings as this how you see the dwellings within Riverside Green. Areas of detached garages are not included.

Property	Property type	Approximate plot size (m ²)
The site	Detached	168
1 Riverside Green	Detached	681
2 Riverside Green	Detached	731
3 Riverside Green	Detached	579
4 Riverside Green	Detached	696
5 Riverside Green	Detached	594
6 Riverside Green	End-terrace	252
7 Riverside Green	Detached	285
8 Riverside Green	Terrace	148
9 Riverside Green	Detached	287
10 Riverside Green	Terrace	139
11 Riverside Green	Semi-detached	352
12 Riverside Green	Terrace	139
14 Riverside Green	End-terrace	258
15 Riverside Green	Semi-detached	349
16 Riverside Green	Detached	475
18 Riverside Green	Semi-detached	241
20 Riverside Green	Semi-detached	215
22 Riverside Green	Semi-detached	221
24 Riverside Green	Semi-detached	233

The above shows that there are a variety of plot sizes within Riverside Green. As per the agenda report, it is recognised that the resultant dwelling would be within a plot that is on the smaller size of those in the vicinity, however, when considering the variety of plot sizes the proposal would be seen in context with, it is not considered that the proposed resultant plot size would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2.4 Impact on residential amenity

Distance between the site and numbers 11 and 15 Riverside Green

The representations received state that the distance between the front elevations of 11 and 15 Riverside Green and the proposal would be 13.4 metres rather than the 14 metres stated at paragraph 8.26 of the agenda report.

Distances between these neighbouring dwellings and the proposed development can be clarified as follows:

- Distance from front wall of numbers 11 and 15 Riverside Green and the boundary with the site – approximately 13 metres.
- Distance from the front wall of the numbers of 11 and 15 Riverside Green and the proposed rear wall of the proposed dwelling – approximately 13.8 metres (the plans show an 800mm distance between the boundary and the proposed rear wall of the proposed dwelling).

The above are approximate distances and have been scaled from the submitted plans.

- 2.5 The above distances do not alter the original considerations as set out in paragraphs 8.26 – 8.33 of the agenda report. In addition to these considerations, in relation to overbearing, it should be noted that the existing conifers, as a result of their size could be considered to be overbearing from the front windows of numbers 11 and 15 Riverside Green. The proposals, whilst introducing a wall to this boundary, are not considered to adversely change this overbearing impact to the extent that the amenities of the occupiers of numbers 11 and 15 are adversely affected.
- 2.6 **Comparison with previous scheme**
Application 07/01030/FULLS proposed a single dwelling on this site. The application was withdrawn by the applicant before it was refused by the Local Planning Authority. The 2007 application proposed a two bedroom dwelling positioned towards the front of the site (front elevation was proposed to run parallel with the wall of number 5 Riverside Green). With parking space to the front. This is materially different to the proposals now being considered. No formal decision was made on the 2007 application. Each application should be determined on its own merits, the considerations set out at in the agenda report reflect the material considerations of the proposals now in front of SAPC.
- 2.7 **Highways**
As mentioned in paragraph 2.2 above, the position of highway land has been confirmed by Hampshire County Council (HCC). The plan provided by HCC confirms that the site includes highway land (the applicant has served notice on the highway authority). The plan also confirms that the area of land to be developed e.g. the area of the site that is to include the proposed dwelling, amenity space and parking areas are not located on highway land. Contrary to comments made in the representations, the proposed area within the site that would be used for parking is not shown to be on highway land on the map provided by HCC. Parking can thus be provided within part of the site that is in the applicant's ownership. A condition requiring the provision and retention of parking is recommended as per the agenda report (condition 11).
- 2.8 In addition to the above, officers have been in further discussions with the highways officer at HCC with regards to the proposals and have made them aware of the objections that have been received, particularly those objections relating to parking. The highway officer maintains their view as set out at paragraph 5.3 of the agenda report.
- 2.9 The appeal decision concerning the adjacent site assessed highway safety implications along the entire length of the unmetalled section of Riverside Green.
- 3.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**
Unchanged.

APPLICATION NO.	18/01437/FULLS
SITE	Starlings , Whinwhistle Road, East Wellow, SO51 6BN, WELLOW
COMMITTEE DATE	18 th September 2018
ITEM NO.	9
PAGE NO.	51 - 73

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 Attendees

Cllr Adams King, Cllr Bailey, Cllr Bundy, Cllr Finlay.

1.2 Apologies

Cllr C Dowden, Cllr A Dowden, Cllr Richards, Cllr Collier, Cllr Hibberd, Cllr Baverstock, Cllr Tupper.

2.0 **REPRESENTATIONS**

2.1 Statement received from residents who have submitted their objections to TVBC – Further objections and comments not covered in agenda report

- The materials to be used are contrary to the advice given in the Wellow village design statement, pg 21. The external material proposed at first floor level in the new development is going to be fibre cement boarding, which will be out of keeping & does not blend with the adjacent properties and compliment the natural environment & the local area.
- Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016: In accordance with the 2016 Test Valley Local Plan, the proposed development would appear to be contrary to pg 54 para 5.39; the development does not fall under permissive development for community need or affordable housing.
- Refusal for back garden development in Hamdown Crescent in 1998 (Plan no. TVS 8384), and again in Hamdown Crescent in 2009 (app. No, 09/00026/FULLS), both of which are only a few hundred metres from the current proposal. The reasons for refusal meet with all material criteria we have stated in this objection.
- If regardless of Parish and residents' objections, you decide to consider this application for permission, would you liaise with Hampshire Council to offer permanent traffic calming measures on Whinwhistle Road? There is clearly a major concern of added vehicles entering & exiting this road, especially with this proposed development, therefore permanent traffic calming can only be seen as an added safety measure.

Whilst we fully appreciate that you're under pressure from Central Government for increased housing, if you are mindful of giving consent, then we would ask for the following conditions;

- Tree planting scheme to be approved prior to commencement of works on site & implemented prior to occupation of the house. Reason - to respect the privacy of the neighbours.
- Close boarded fence to be erected on Mr Harrison's side of the boundaries to reduce noise, pollution, night lights from manoeuvring

vehicles - to mitigate reduction in amenity value of local residents.

- Improved design and use of materials particularly the large central window which is adding greatly to the perceived feeling of loss of privacy.
- Provision of a scheme of bat boxes to mitigate the disturbance of local bats by the recent removal of mature trees at the bottom of the garden.

3.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 Materials

Concern has been raised that the materials to be used are contrary to the advice given in the Wellow village design statement, pg 21. The external material proposed at first floor level in the new development is going to be fibre cement boarding. It is noted that this material is not present elsewhere in this part of Whinwhistle Road. However, the Wellow village design statement page 21, no 14 for guidance on building also highlights that '*Nothing contained here should inhibit innovative designs or the use of new materials providing that they blend with the adjacent properties and complement the natural environment*'.

The use of the cladding is considered to introduce a new material whilst respecting the current materials seen in Florence Close which includes tile hanging detail at first floor. This material is considered to compliment the natural environment & the local area and the final material appearance would be agreed through a condition for samples.

3.2 Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016: pg 54 para 5.39

There is concern the development does not fall under permissive development for community need or affordable housing. Paragraph 5.39 reads in full as:

There are no proposals to allocate housing sites within the rural villages. However, through rural exception sites and development on infill sites as a result of the revised settlement boundaries a contribution to the housing supply is justified. Additional housing may come forward as a consequence of community led initiatives either based on the proposed policy COM9 or neighbourhood planning.

This submission is not community led therefore COM9 is not relevant. The application site falls within a settlement boundary within Wellow and therefore this development would make a contribution to the housing supply.

3.3 Planning History

Page 62 of the agenda report considers the historic planning applications at the application site. Further applications have been raised as considerations based on the refusal of back garden development in Hamdown Crescent in 1998 (Ref. TVS 8384), and again in Hamdown Crescent in 2009 (Ref. No, 09/00026/FULLS). Both of these applications were located in relatively close proximity to the current proposal to the north of the application site and resulted in different relationships with other properties in the area than that proposed at this time.

3.4 Traffic Calming on Whinwhistle Road

It is not considered that a development of 1 dwelling would have a significant impact on the current traffic levels on Whinwhistle Road that justifies specific mitigation as confirmed by the Highways Officer who raises no objections.

3.5 Tree planting scheme and fencing

The applicant has confirmed an intention to agree a suitable landscaping design which can include tree screening from neighbouring properties including number 7 Florence Close and Sonaisali. The applicant has also confirmed that a new 1.8m high close boarded fence between the land and Sonaisali as well as a 2.m high acoustic fence adjacent to the rear garden of number 6 Florence Close will be provided. A further 1.8m close board fence would be provided around the existing rear garden at Starlings. This has been provided in specific relation to neighbours concerns about overlooking and disturbance. In order to ensure delivery of these features, as contained in the application a condition is recommended to secure this and future maintenance.

3.6 Large central window on development

The proposed first floor central window was a large three pane arrangement floor to ceiling on the landing. The application has been amended to reduce any perceived overlooking by providing smaller windows of similar size to the other two on the front elevation. This is shown on page 69 of the agenda report.

3.7 Bat boxes

The submitted ecology survey makes recommendations for bird and bat boxes and this is conditioned to be provided in the agenda report.

3.8 New Forest SPA payment

This payment of £1300 was secured today, 18th September 2018 as such recommendation B has been removed.

3.9 Measurements

Further to the viewing panel a request was made for certain distances to be measured across the site. These distances can be found on the attached plan.

3.10 Spelling Error

Paragraph 8.22 of the agenda report - The last sentence should read *Taking into account each neighbours relationship with the site it is considered that the development can be provided without significant harm to the amenities of the surrounding neighbouring properties and subject to conditions the development can be provided in accordance with policy LHW4.*

4.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

PERMISSION subject to conditions 1 – 13 and notes 1 and 2 of agenda report recommendation and additional conditions 14, 15 and 16 as follows:

- 14. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until full details of hard and soft landscape works to be provided adjacent the boundaries of number 7 Florence Close and Sonaisali have been submitted and approved.**

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.

- 15. 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 and an implementation programme for the landscape works to be provided adjacent the boundaries of number 7 Florence Close and Sonaisali, 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.

- 16. Prior to occupation of the dwelling hereby approved a 1.8m high close board fence shall be provided adjacent the neighbouring property Sonaisali and a 2m high acoustic barrier shall be provided adjacent the rear garden of number 6. The fencing shall thereafter be retained as such unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can exercise control in the locality in the interest of local amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) policy LHW4.

SITE LAYOUT 1:250



aap architects ltd
architects & urban designers
101 0845 345 1473
Email: info@aaparchitects.co.uk
www.aaparchitects.co.uk
Richmond Court, 14 Beller Road, East Welling, Kent, SE18 3LW

Amenade
Landscape Architecture & Urban Design
101 0845 345 1473
Email: info@amenade.co.uk
www.amenade.co.uk
Richmond Court, 14 Beller Road, East Welling, Kent, SE18 3LW

Project Name: **PROPOSED DWELLING**
Applicant: **ROMSEY DEVELOPMENTS LTD**
Applic. No.: **16/01487/FULLS**
Rec'd: **8 AUG 2018 J**
Decision: **DECLINE**

The site is based on a topographical survey undertaken by [Name] dated [Date].
Surrounding information copied from Ordnance Survey Promap. Crown Copyright. Licence Number 100022432

- LEGEND**
- Existing trees & RPA's
 - Existing trees to be removed
 - Existing landscaping
 - Existing hedges/paths to be removed
 - Proposed planting (except to outline landscape design)
 - Existing Levels
 - Proposed levels - existing level & raised ground level (subject to engineer's design)
 - Proposed SW drainage
 - Existing SW drainage
 - Proposed foot drainage
 - Foot & sw drains where shown are for information only. Final design to be agreed with the local authority.
 - 20m ground level contours (subject to engineer's design)
 - Proposed SW drainage
 - Proposed foot drainage
 - Foot & sw drains where shown are for information only. Final design to be agreed with the local authority.
 - 20m ground level contours (subject to engineer's design)
 - Proposed SW drainage
 - Proposed foot drainage
 - Foot & sw drains where shown are for information only. Final design to be agreed with the local authority.
 - 20m ground level contours (subject to engineer's design)

aap architects ltd
architects & urban designers
101 0845 345 1473
Email: info@aaparchitects.co.uk
www.aaparchitects.co.uk
Richmond Court, 14 Beller Road, East Welling, Kent, SE18 3LW

Project Name: **Proposed Dwelling**
Drawing Title: **Stairings**
Drawing Number: **Whinistle Road**
Client: **East Welling**

Client: **Romsey Developments Ltd**
Drawing Title: **Site Layout**
Drawing Number: **1817**
Drawing Date: **01 E**
Drawing Scale: **1:250 (A2)**
Date: **Apr 18**