

## Notice of Meeting

# Southern Area Planning Committee

**Date:** Tuesday, 25 September 2018

**Time:** 17:30

**Venue:** Main Hall, Crosfield Hall, Broadwater Road, Romsey, Hampshire, SO51 8GL

**For further information or enquiries please contact:**

Caroline Lovelock - **01264 368014**

email [clovelock@testvalley.gov.uk](mailto:clovelock@testvalley.gov.uk)

**Legal and Democratic Service**

Test Valley Borough Council,  
Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road,  
Andover, Hampshire,  
SP10 3AJ

[www.testvalley.gov.uk](http://www.testvalley.gov.uk)

The recommendations contained in the Agenda are made by the Officers and these recommendations may or may not be accepted by the Committee.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEME**

*If members of the public wish to address the meeting they should notify the Legal and Democratic Service at the Council's Beech Hurst office by noon on the working day before the meeting.*

## Membership of Southern Area Planning Committee

<b>MEMBER</b>		<b>WARD</b>
Councillor A Finlay	Chairman	Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams
Councillor I Richards	Vice-Chairman	Abbey
Councillor N Adams-King		Blackwater
Councillor J Anderdon		Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams
Councillor G Bailey		Blackwater
Councillor D Baverstock		Cupernham
Councillor A Beesley		Valley Park
Councillor P Boulton		Broughton and Stockbridge
Councillor P Bundy		Chilworth, Nursling and Rownhams
Councillor D Busk		Broughton and Stockbridge
Councillor C Collier		Abbey
Councillor M Cooper		Tadburn
Councillor S Cosier		North Baddesley
Councillor A Dowden		North Baddesley
Councillor C Dowden		Valley Park
Councillor M Hatley		Ampfield and Braishfield
Councillor I Hibberd		Romsey Extra
Councillor P Hurst		Tadburn
Councillor I Jeffrey		Dun Valley
Councillor A Johnston		Romsey Extra
Councillor J Ray		Cupernham
Councillor C Thom		Valley Park
Councillor A Tupper		North Baddesley
Councillor A Ward		King's Somborne, Michelmersh and Timsbury

## Southern Area Planning Committee

Tuesday, 25 September 2018

### AGENDA

The order of these items may change as a result of members of the public wishing to speak

- 1 Apologies
- 2 Public Participation
- 3 Declarations of Interest
- 4 Urgent Items
- 5 Minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2018 will be reported to the meeting on 9 October 2018
- 6 Information Notes
- 7 17/01615/OUTS - 26.06.2017 10 - 83  
**(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION)**  
SITE: Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road, Flexford, SO52 9BH, **AMPFIELD**  
CASE OFFICER: Mrs Sarah Appleton
- 8 18/01568/FULLS - 18.06.2018 84 - 92  
**(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION)**  
SITE: 85 Upton Crescent, Nursling, SO16 8AA, **NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS**  
CASE OFFICER: Mr Jacob Cooke

## ITEM 6

**TEST VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**INFORMATION NOTES**

### **Availability of Background Papers**

Background papers may be inspected up to five working days before the date of the Committee meeting and for four years thereafter. Requests to inspect the background papers, most of which will be on the application file, should be made to the case officer named in the report or to the Development Manager. Although there is no legal provision for inspection of the application file before the report is placed on the agenda for the meeting, an earlier inspection may be agreed on application to the Head of Planning and Building.

### **Reasons for Committee Consideration**

The majority of applications are determined by the Head of Planning and Building in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation which is set out in the Council's Constitution. However, some applications are determined at the Area Planning Committees, or the Planning Control Committee instead, and this will happen if any of the following reasons apply:

- Applications which are contrary to the provisions of an approved or draft development plan or other statement of approved planning policy where adverse representations have been received and which is recommended for approval.
- Applications which the Head of Planning and Building Services considers are of significant local interest or impact.
- Applications (excluding notifications) where a Member requests in writing, with reasons, within the stipulated time span that they be submitted to Committee.
- Applications submitted by or on behalf of the Council, or any company in which the Council holds an interest for its own developments except for the approval of minor developments.
- Notifications on which material planning objection(s) has been received within the stipulated time span (the initial 21 day publicity period) and no agreement with the Chairman of the appropriate Committee after consultation with the appropriate Ward Member(s) has been reached.



- Determination of applications (excluding applications for advertisement consent, listed building consent, and applications resulting from the withdrawal by condition of domestic permitted development rights; Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes B, C, D, E, F, G, and H of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or as amended) on which a material planning objection(s) has been received in the stipulated time span and which cannot be resolved by negotiation or through the imposition of conditions and where the officer's recommendation is for approval, following consultation with the Ward Members, the latter having the right to request that the application be reported to Committee for decision.

### **Public Speaking at the Meeting**

The Council has a public participation scheme, which invites members of the public, Parish Council representatives and applicants to address the Committee on applications. Full details of the scheme are available from Planning and Building Services or from the Committee Administrator at the Council Offices, Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road, Andover. Copies are usually sent to all those who have made representations. Anyone wishing to speak must book with the Committee Administrator within the stipulated time period otherwise they will not be allowed to address the Committee.

Speakers are limited to a total of three minutes per item for Councillors with prejudicial interests, three minutes for the Parish Council, three minutes for all objectors, three minutes for all supporters and three minutes for the applicant/agent. Where there are multiple supporters or multiple objectors wishing to speak the Chairman may limit individual speakers to less than three minutes with a view to accommodating multiple speakers within the three minute time limit. Speakers may be asked questions by the Members of the Committee, but are not permitted to ask questions of others or to join in the debate. Speakers are not permitted to circulate or display plans, photographs, illustrations or textual material during the Committee meeting as any such material should be sent to the Members *and* officers in advance of the meeting to allow them time to consider the content.

### **Content of Officer's Report**

It should be noted that the Officer's report will endeavour to include a summary of the relevant site characteristics, site history, policy issues, consultations carried out with both internal and external consultees and the public and then seek to make a professional judgement as to whether permission should be granted. However, the officer's report will usually summarise many of the issues, particularly consultations received from consultees and the public, and anyone wishing to see the full response must ask to consult the application file.

### **Status of Officer's Recommendations and Committee's Decisions**

The recommendations contained in this report are made by the officers at the time the report was prepared. A different recommendation may be made at the meeting should circumstances change and the officer's recommendations may not be accepted by the Committee.

In order to facilitate debate in relation to an application, the Chairman will move the officer's recommendations in the report, which will be seconded by the Vice Chairman. Motions are debated by the Committee in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure. A binding decision is made only when the Committee has formally considered and voted in favour of a motion in relation to the application and, pursuant to that resolution, the decision notice has subsequently been issued by the Council.

### **Conditions and Reasons for Refusal**

Suggested reasons for refusal and any conditions are set out in full in the officer's recommendation.

Officers or the Committee may add further reasons for refusal or conditions during the Committee meeting and Members may choose to refuse an application recommended for permission by the Officers or to permit an application recommended for refusal. In all cases, clear reasons will be given, by whoever is promoting the new condition or reason for refusal, to explain why the change is being made.

### **Decisions subject to Completion of a Planning Obligation**

For some applications, a resolution is passed to grant planning permission subject to the completion of an appropriate planning obligation (often referred to as a Section 106 agreement). The obligation can restrict development or the use of the land, require operations or activities to be carried out, require the land to be used in a specified way or require payments to be made to the authority.

New developments will usually be required to contribute towards the infrastructure required to serve a site and to cater for additional demand created by any new development and its future occupants. Typically, such requirements include contributions to community facilities, village halls, parks and play areas, playing fields and improvements to roads, footpaths, cycleways and public transport.

Upon completion of the obligation, the Head of Planning and Building is delegated to grant permission subject to the listed conditions. However, it should be noted that the obligation usually has to be completed sufficiently in advance of the planning application determination date to allow the application to be issued. If this does not happen, the application may be refused for not resolving the issues required within the timescale set to deal with the application.

### **Deferred Applications**

Applications may not be decided at the meeting for a number of reasons as follows:

- \* The applicant may choose to withdraw the application. No further action would be taken on that proposal and the file is closed.

- \* Officers may recommend deferral because the information requested or amended plans have not been approved or there is insufficient time for consultation on amendments.
- \* The Committee may resolve to seek additional information or amendments.
- \* The Committee may resolve to visit the site to assess the effect of the proposal on matters that are not clear from the plans or from the report. These site visits are not public meetings.
- \* Where the Committee has resolved to make a decision, which in the opinion of the Head of Planning and Building, has a possible conflict with policy, public interest or possible claims for costs against the Council, those applications shall be referred to the Planning Control Committee for determination.

### **Visual Display of Plans and Photographs**

Plans are included in the officers' reports in order to identify the site and its surroundings. The location plan will normally be the most up-to-date available from Ordnance Survey and to scale. The other plans are not a complete copy of the application plans and may not be to scale, particularly when they have been reduced from large size paper plans. If further information is needed or these plans are unclear please refer to the submitted application in the reception areas in Beech Hurst, Andover or the Former Magistrates Court office, Romsey. Plans displayed at the meeting to assist the Members may include material additional to the written reports.

Photographs are used to illustrate particular points on most of the items and the officers usually take these. Photographs submitted in advance by applicants or objectors may be used at the discretion of the officers.

### **Human Rights**

The European Convention on Human Rights" ("ECHR") was brought into English Law, via the Human Rights Act 1998 ("HRA"), as from October 2000.

The HRA introduces an obligation on the Council to act consistently with the ECHR.

There are 2 Convention Rights likely to be most relevant to Planning Decisions:

- \* Article 1 of the 1st Protocol - The Right to the Enjoyment of Property.
- \* Article 8 - Right for Respect for Home, Privacy and Family Life.

It is important to note that these types of right are not unlimited - although in accordance with the EU concept of "proportionality", any interference with these rights must be sanctioned by Law (e.g. by the Town & Country Planning Acts) and must go no further than necessary.

Essentially, private interests must be weighed against the wider public interest and against competing private interests. Such a balancing exercise is already implicit in the decision making processes of the Committee. However, Members must specifically bear Human Rights issues in mind when reaching decisions on all planning applications and enforcement action.

### **Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC)**

The Council has a duty under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 as follows: "*every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity*".

It is considered that this duty has been properly addressed within the process leading up to the formulation of the policies in the Revised Local Plan. Further regard is had in relation to specific planning applications through completion of the biodiversity checklists for validation, scoping and/or submission of Environmental Statements and any statutory consultations with relevant conservation bodies on biodiversity aspects of the proposals. Provided any recommendations arising from these processes are conditioned as part of any grant of planning permission (or included in reasons for refusal of any planning application) then the duty to ensure that biodiversity interest has been conserved, as far as practically possible, will be considered to have been met.

### **Other Legislation**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that determination of applications be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for the Borough comprises the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016). Material considerations are defined by Case Law and includes, amongst other things, draft Development Plan Documents (DPD), Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and other relevant guidance including Development Briefs, Government advice, amenity considerations, crime and community safety, traffic generation and safety.

On the 27 March 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as a starting point for decision making. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Framework sets out that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date permission should be granted unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

However, account can also be taken of policies in emerging development plans, which are going through the statutory procedure towards adoption. Annex 1 of the NPPF sets out that greater weight can be attached to such policies depending upon:

- The stage of plan preparation of the emerging plan;
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies; and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that 'In assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.'

## ITEM 7

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	17/01615/OUTS
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	OUTLINE APPLICATION - SOUTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	26.06.2017
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Perbury (Developments) Ltd
<b>SITE</b>	Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road, Flexford, SO52 9BH, <b>AMPFIELD</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Outline application for demolition of existing industrial buildings and re-development to form a Care Village (Use Class C2), comprising 2-3 storey care home building/community hub containing up to either 65 no. care beds or up to 48 no. "extra care" units and core facilities: a series of 2-2.5 storey buildings containing up to 101 no.1 and 2 bedroom "extra care" units; single vehicular access from Baddesley Road (including retained access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park); associated car and cycle parking spaces; provision of associated outdoor amenity space; provision of semi-natural "ecological" buffer zone and grassland; proposed new landscaping/tree planting; provision of on-site drainage; and undergrounding of existing over-head electricity lines. New barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park (Class B8/B1 - "sui generis")
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amended indicative landscape strategy received 17/08/2017</li><li>• Additional information with regards to policy LE10 and photo montages received 30/08/2017</li><li>• Supporting design statement submitted 13/10/2017</li><li>• Additional flooding information submitted 16/10/2017</li><li>• Amended application form submitted 19/10/2017</li></ul> <p>Further amended and additional information relating to a change to the indicative layout was submitted on 19/02/2018, 08/03/2018, 04/04/2018, 05/04/2018 and 10/04/2018. The description of the development was changed as a result of the information received on the 19/02/2018 and 08/03/2018. The amended description is shown above.</p>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Mrs Sarah Appleton

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application was considered by the Southern Area Planning Committee on 15 May 2018 when it was resolved to:

Delegated to the Head of Planning and Building subject to the completion of a legal agreement securing the following:

- Restriction of occupation of the units of accommodation including the setting out of a Basic Care Package;
- Restriction on occupation to ensure that communal facilities are provided;
- Requirement to submit and implement a full Travel plan, payment of the Travel Plan approval and monitoring fees and provision of a surety mechanism to ensure the implementation of the Travel Plan;
- Secure financial contribution towards additional street lighting on Baddesley Road; and
- Requirement to provide access to the proposed community facilities to older people who reside in the locality of the site.

then PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes.

- 1.2 Since the consideration of the application at the May SAPC, an updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been published (July 2018). This updated version of the NPPF replaces the previous version (March 2012) that was current at the time the application was considered by the SAPC. It is therefore necessary for the Committee to consider the application in light of the new material planning consideration before a decision can be issued. This report is an update dealing with an assessment of these changes in relation to the application. In other respects, the reports to the SAPC on the 15 May 2018 apply and these are included as follows:

- The report presented in the SAPC agenda for its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2018 is attached at **Appendix A**.
- The Update Paper reported to the SAPC meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2018 is attached at **Appendix B**.

- 1.3 The application was originally brought to the Southern Area Planning Committee in accordance with the Member and Officer Interests Protocol.

## 2.0 POLICY

### 2.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### 2.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)

COM1 – Housing Provision 2011-2029

COM2 – Settlement hierarchy

COM15 – Infrastructure



LE10 – Retention of land and strategic employment sites

LE17 – Existing employment sites in the countryside

E1 – High quality development in the Borough

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

E3 – Local Gaps

E5 – Biodiversity

E7 – Water management

E8 – Pollution

E9 – Heritage

LHW4 – Amenity

T1 – Managing movement

T2 – Parking standards

### 2.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

- Ampfield Village Design Statement (VDS)
- Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

### 3.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

#### 3.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Whether, in considering the guidance contained in the NPPF as a material planning consideration that has been published since the SAPC meeting on the 15 May 2018, the proposed development is considered acceptable.

#### 3.2 **National Planning Policy Framework – background**

Paragraph 2 of the NPPF states that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan. Paragraph 12 recognises that the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. It goes on to advise that where a proposed development conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not usually be granted and that local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed. Paragraph 213 reinforces that the policies of local plans should not be considered out of date because of their adoption prior to the publication of the updated NPPF and confirms that due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

#### 3.3 **The principle of development**

The previous report to SAPC (**Appendix A**) addresses the main issues of principle concerning the development in the countryside. Paragraph 8.32 of the report concludes that the proposed development is considered acceptable under policies COM2(b) and LE10(b) of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 (RLP). The updated NPPF does not include any new guidance which changes the situation as put forward in the original report. Therefore, in respect of the principle of development, the discussion which leads to the conclusion in paragraph 8.32 of the original report remains valid.



### **Other considerations detailed in the 15 May 2018 agenda report**

With respect to the following considerations in the original Officer's report (**Appendix A**):

- Economic impacts (para. 8.33);
- Affordable housing (para.8.40);
- Amount of development and impact on surrounding landscape character, local gap and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area (para.8.41);
- Impact on neighbour amenity (para.8.56);
- Ecology (para.8.64);
- Highways (para.8.83);
- Flooding and Drainage (para.8.97);
- Ground contamination (para.8.113);
- Archaeology (para.8.116);
- Planning balance (para.8.117); and
- Other matters, including previously developed land and site ownership considerations (para. 8.122).

It is considered that the updated NPPF does not introduce a materially different approach to these matters such that the original officer assessment of the proposal as set out in the original report to SAPC is now unsound. The corresponding Development Plan policies are not inconsistent with the updated NPPF such that a different recommendation on these matters arises.

#### **3.4 Legal agreement**

The required legal agreement has not yet been completed. Consequently the recommendation reflects the need to secure the same obligations to those set out in the previous SAPC recommendation.

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

4.1 It is clear that the publication of the revised NPPF represents a new material consideration compared to the position as it existed when the SAPC met on the 15 May 2018. However, it is not considered that the revised NPPF introduces a materially different approach to considering the planning considerations relevant to this application as outlined above. The proposal does not conflict with the revised NPPF and on this basis there is no reason to reach a different outcome to that of the SAPC on 15 May 2018.

#### **5.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building subject to the completion of a legal agreement securing the following:**

- **Restriction of occupation of the units of accommodation including the setting out of a Basic Care Package;**
- **Restriction on occupation to ensure that communal facilities are provided;**
- **Undergrounding of existing overhead electricity lines;**

- Requirement to submit and implement a full Travel Plan, payment of the Travel Plan approval and monitoring fees and provision of a surety mechanism to ensure implementation of the Travel Plan; and
- Secure financial contribution towards additional street lighting along Baddesley Road;

then PERMISSION subject to:

1. Applications for the approval of all the reserved matters referred to herein shall be made within a period of three years from the date of this permission. The development to which the permission relates shall be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:
  - i) five years from the date of this permission: or
  - ii) two years from the final approval of the said reserved matters, or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: To comply with the provision of S.92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Approval of the details of the layout, and appearance of the building(s), and the landscaping of the site (herein after called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before the development is commenced.

Reason: To comply with Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Management Procedure) (England) Development Procedure) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order).
3. The development hereby permitted shall be used only as a care village comprising a care home/community hub building including core facilities, extra care units and ancillary uses. The barn/store hereby permitted shall only be used as a store/office for the mobile home park known as Wheelhouse Park and for no other purposes, including any purpose in Classes C2, B8 or B1; of the Schedule of to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2015, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can exercise control in the locality in the interest of the local amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy COM2.
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the Parameters Plan Ref. BRS.2581\_38 Rev B.

Reason: To ensure that proposed buildings are appropriately located within the site to prevent adverse impacts on the Local Gap, surrounding landscape character and on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policies E1, E2 and E3.
5. Prior to the commencement of development the means of access to the site detailed on plan number 5303/204 shall be fully implemented and retained as such at all times.

**Reason: To ensure that the access into the site is provided to an appropriate standard to serve the development in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.**

6. **A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the commencement of development. The Construction Traffic Management Plan 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 approved details shall be fully implemented before development is commenced.**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

7. **The landscaping of the site should be undertaken broadly in accordance with the details set out within the Landscape Strategy Plan (Illustrative) drawing number BRS.2581\_28 Sheet 1/2 Rev D and BRS.2581\_28 Sheet 2/3 Rev D.**

**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.**

8. **The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures set out in the Ampfield Care Village Ecological Impact Assessment, February 2018 (P16/10-2E).**

**Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

9. **Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed Construction Environment Management Plan that includes measures to avoid impacts to Trodds Copse SSSI, measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for impacts to protected species and habitat losses, and biodiversity enhancements to be implemented across the site with particular reference to the northern and eastern boundaries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with the approved details, with all enhancement features being permanently retained.**

**Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

10. **Prior to the commencement of development a detailed external lighting plan showing that the northern and eastern site boundaries and associated habitats associated with the stream corridor and Trodds Copse SSSI will remain unilluminated shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To avoid impacts to foraging bats, in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

- 11. All those involved with the development should be informed of the status and legal obligations attached to the Trodds Copse SSSI designation and where the boundary of the protected area is.  
Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 12. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (Issue 6, CEC, February 2018).  
Reason: In the interests of water management in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E7.**
- 13. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority, construction and demolition activities including the delivery or removal of materials to or from the site, shall only take place between the hours of 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08:00 hours and 13:00 hours on Saturday (excluding Bank Holidays). No such activity shall occur on Sundays or Bank Holidays.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 14. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority, deliveries and unloading activities servicing the care home/community hub building including core facilities shall only occur between the hours of 08:00 hours and 18:00 hours Monday to Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 15. Before the commencement of development of the Community Hub building, a detailed design and layout of the building shall be submitted together with a scheme for mitigating the noise impact from the use of this building for approval in writing by the local planning authority. Before the first use of the Community Hub building the approved design, layout and noise mitigation scheme shall be implemented and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, maintained thereafter.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 16. Prior to the installation of any fixed plant or equipment a scheme for mitigating the noise impact from any fixed plant or equipment shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the first use of such equipment unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, maintained thereafter.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**

- 17. Prior to the installation of any cooking extraction equipment, a scheme for mitigating the odour impact from any cooking extraction plant or equipment shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the first use of such equipment unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and maintained thereafter.**  
**Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 18. No development shall commence (other than any approved demolition and site clearance works) until an assessment of the nature and extent of any contamination and a scheme for remediating the contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment must be undertaken by a competent person, and shall assess the presence of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The assessment shall comprise of an intrusive site investigation as recommended by ERS and detailed in Section 11 of their Phase 1 Site Investigation report dated 16th June 2016, and in the event that contamination is found, or is considered likely, a scheme containing remediation proposals designed to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use. Such remediation proposals shall include clear remediation objectives and criteria, an appraisal of the remediation options, and the arrangements for the supervision of remediation works by a competent person. The site shall not be brought in to use until a verification report, for the purpose of certifying adherence to the approved remediation scheme, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**  
**Reason: To ensure a safe living/working environment in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E8.**
- 19. In the event that contamination (that was not previously identified) is found at any time during construction works, the presence of such contamination shall be reported in writing to the Local Planning Authority without delay and development shall be suspended on the affected part of the site until a remediation scheme for dealing with that contamination has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved remediation scheme shall be implemented and, if requested, a verification report, for the purpose of certifying adherence to the approved remediation scheme, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the site being brought in to use.**  
**Reason: To ensure a safe living/working environment in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E8.**

- 20. Prior to the commencement of development details of the proposed means of foul and surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In relation to foul drainage, such information should include a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul disposal and a implementation timetable. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To ensure that the development can be served by appropriate foul and surface water drainage and in the interests of biodiversity in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policies E5, E7 and E8.**

**Note to applicant:**

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



## **APPENDIX A**

### **Officer Report to Southern Area Planning Committee on 15 May 2018**

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	17/01615/OUTS
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	OUTLINE APPLICATION - SOUTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	26.06.2017
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Perbury (Developments) Ltd
<b>SITE</b>	Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road, Flexford, SO52 9BH, <b>AMPFIELD</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Outline application for demolition of existing industrial buildings and re-development to form a Care Village (Use Class C2), comprising 2-3 storey care home building/community hub containing up to either 65 no. care beds or up to 48 no. "extra care" units and core facilities: a series of 2-2.5 storey buildings containing up to 101 no.1 and 2 bedroom "extra care" units; single vehicular access from Baddesley Road (including retained access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park); associated car and cycle parking spaces; provision of associated outdoor amenity space; provision of semi-natural "ecological" buffer zone and grassland; proposed new landscaping/tree planting; provision of on-site drainage; and undergrounding of existing over-head electricity lines. New barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park (Class B8/B1 - "sui generis")
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amended indicative landscape strategy received 17/08/2017</li><li>• Additional information with regards to policy LE10 and photo montages received 30/08/2017</li><li>• Supporting design statement submitted 13/10/2017</li><li>• Additional flooding information submitted 16/10/2017</li><li>• Amended application form submitted 19/10/2017</li></ul> <p>Further amended and additional information relating to a change to the indicative layout was submitted on 19/02/2018, 08/03/2018, 04/04/2018, 05/04/2018 and 10/04/2018. The description of the development was changed as a result of the information received on the 19/02/2018 and 08/03/2018. The amended description is shown above.</p>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	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 in accordance with the Member and Officer Interests Protocol.

**2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

2.1 The site is 4.19 hectares in size and is located within the Parish of Ampfield to the north west of Baddesley Road. Much of the site has historically and is currently being used for industrial/commercial activities. Uses at part of the site have included:

- Production of bricks
- Milling of timber
- Haulage and demolition
- Storage of commercial vehicles
- Plant yard
- Storage of materials for the construction industry
- Siting of shipping containers
- Operation of small businesses as their offices/stores
- Storage of caravans
- Tip for inert materials

A Certificate of Lawfulness has been issued (see paragraph 4.3) in relation to the use of the site. This part of the site is therefore considered to fall under the definition of 'previously developed land' as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2.2 The applicant states that in order to form a 'clear, defensible boundary to the northern part of the western boundary, where it meets grazing land, a more logical boundary (to that in the issued Certificate of Lawfulness) is proposed to be formed'. As such, 0.467 hectares of greenfield land is located within the site. To compensate for this, 0.449 hectares of previously developed land is proposed to be transferred to buffer/undeveloped land. Part of the site is also shown to have been historically used as a Christmas Tree plantation. This area was not included within the area included within the Certificate of Lawfulness.

2.3 As a result of the above, whilst most of the site is previously development land, the site also incorporates some greenfield land.

2.4 Neighbouring sites include 'Wheelhouse Park' to the south west. Wheelhouse Park is a mobile home park which can include up to 20 mobile homes and is separated from the site by an access road and vegetation and is set at a higher level than the site. Currently, steps link the Wheelhouse Park Access Road and the site. There is an existing dwelling known as North Hill Cottage to the south of the site entrance from Baddesley Road.

2.5 To site bounds Monks Brook to the north/north east. Monks Brook, along with adjacent trees and vegetation separate the site from the neighbouring dwellings along Flexford Close. The dwellings at Flexford Close are terraced, two storey in height and are positioned on lower ground in relation to the site.



To the north, the site bounds Trodds Copse, an area of woodland which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). To the south east, on the opposite site of Baddesley Road, is Flexford Nature Reserve which is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

2.6 Baddesley Road is the boundary between Test Valley Borough Council and Eastleigh Borough Council.

### 3.0 **PROPOSAL**

3.1 The application seeks outline planning permission with detailed approval for access and scale for the construction of a care village following the removal of existing buildings on site. The scheme proposes the following:

- 2-3 storey care home building/community hub containing up to either 65 care beds or up to 48 'extra care' units and core facilities. Core facilities could include a reception area, lounge, kitchens, restaurant/bistro, stores, small shop, managers/staff offices, treatment room, hairdressers salon, fitness room, hydro therapy pool and or/domiciliary care room. Exact facilities within the core building/community hub are to be confirmed in a reserved matters application.
- 2-2.5 storey buildings containing up to 101 1 and 2 bedroom 'extra care' units.
- New barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park.

3.2 In addition to the above, the application proposes an amended access onto Baddesley Road which would retain the existing access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park along with car/cycle parking, outdoor amenity space, provision of an ecological buffer zone and grassland, proposed landscaping, the provision of drainage and the undergrounding of existing over-head electricity lines.

### 3.3 **Community Engagement**

The application is supported by a Consultation Report (Pegasus Group, June 2017). This report documents how the applicant has engaged with the local community and other key stakeholders, summarises the key issues that have emerged and shows how these issues have been addressed as part of the scheme.

3.4 The consultation involved producing and distributing a consultation leaflet, emailing elected representatives, the creation of a project website and the holding of a public exhibition, held in November 2016. The results of the public consultation process is summarised as follows.

### 3.5 Response

The following responses were received:

- 29 postal FREEPOST forms (in relation to the consultation leaflet)
- 19 website feedback
- 29 exhibition comments forms
- 14 'thoughts' board notes were left at the exhibition

The report states that the overall level of interest was modest, indicating that strong feelings do not exist within the local area with regard to the proposals. The majority of those who did respond live close to the site.

- 3.6 The following issues were raised during as a result of the public consultation:
- Pressure on existing health facilities.
  - Concerns in relation to traffic and access.
  - The need for the proposed development.
  - Provision of a shop.
  - Concern over the loss of farmland/green space/creeping urbanisation.
  - Impact on surrounding residents including concerns relating to visual impacts, privacy etc. noise and disturbance, staff accommodation, development of the pump station, drainage, flooding, impact on wildlife, construction issues and rats.

### 3.7 **Supporting documents**

The application is supported by the following documents:

- Supporting Design Document (Pegasus Group, October 2017), Supporting Design Document Addendum (Pegasus Group, February 2018).
- Covering letter including care village comparable (case studies) and application site/Flexford Close comparison.
- Economic Impact Report (Pegasus Group, February 2018).
- Planning Statement (Pegasus Group, February 2018).
- Consultation Report (Pegasus Group, June 2017).
- Design and Access Statement (CLA Architects, June 2017).
- Supplementary Design and Access Statement (CLA Architects March 2018).
- Planning Need Assessment ( 58 Pages, Carterwood June 2017).
- Sustainability Statement (Base Energy Services, February 2018).
- Transport Statement (Cole Easdon Consultants, February 2018).
- Framework Travel Plan (Cole Easdon Consultants, February 2018).
- Information for Habitats Regulations Assessment (Ecological Planning & Research Ltd February 2018).
- Ecological Impact Assessment (Ecological Planning & Research Ltd, February 2018).
- Tree Survey (Pegasus Group, June 2017).
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Pegasus Group, June 2017).
- Supplementary Landscape Statement (Pegasus Group, February 2018).
- Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment (Pegasus Group, June 2017).
- Phase 1 Site Investigation (ERS, June 2016).
- Factual Report (ERS, January 2017.)
- Flood Risk Assessment (Cole Easdon Consultants, February 2018).
- Flood Zone Sequential & Exception Test Report (Pegasus Group, February 2018).

4.0 **HISTORY**

4.1 17/00616/OUTS - Outline application for a Care Village following demolition of existing industrial buildings comprising 65 no. bed, 2-3 storey care home (Class C2); 87 no. 'extra care' units (Class C2); community building (up to 280 sq. m. GFA) (Class D1); 16 no. 'age restricted retirement dormer bungalows' (Class C3); new convenience store (up to 280 sq. m. GFA ) (Class A1); new barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park (100-120 sq. m. GFA) (Class B8/B1 - 'sui generis'); with single vehicular access from Baddesley Road (including retained access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park); new pedestrian access from Baddesley Road to convenience store; associated car and cycle parking spaces; provision of associated outdoor amenity space; provision of semi-natural 'ecological' buffer zone and grassland; proposed new landscaping/tree planting; provision of on-site drainage; and undergrounding of existing overhead electricity lines – WITHDRAWN 15.05.2017.

4.2 17/00637/SCRS - Screening Opinion under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 - Demolition of existing industrial buildings and redevelopment of site to provide 'Care Village' including new convenience store, car and cycle parking provision, outdoor amenity space and new barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park – EIA NOT REQUIRED 05.04.2017.

4.3 16/01889/CLES - Mixed use of the land and existing buildings for general industrial (with ancillary offices)(Class B2); light industrial (Class B1 (c)); storage and distribution (Class B8) together with the use for the parking of commercial vehicles and caravans along with the use for the purposes of a water pumping - station – ISSUED 02.11.2016.

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **First round of consultation in relation to the original proposals submitted on 26.06.2017**

5.2 **Policy** – Objection:

- Conflict with policies COM2 and E3 as the site is located within the countryside and a local gap – overriding justification is needed to address this conflict. The site is previously developed land and if accepted that there is an identified need for Class C2 care home beds and extra care accommodation in the local area, then this is a material consideration in favour of the permission.
- Requirements of policy LE10 need to satisfied.

5.3 **Landscape** – Comments (further to additional submissions relating to landscaping strategy):

- Submitted Supporting Design Document has addressed some of the concerns previously raised – it is essential that the application can clearly demonstrate that the development can accommodate adequate soft landscaping within the site in order to integrate the development within the local landscape character.
- Perimeter landscaping has been addressed and vastly improved.

- Within the development itself, the soft landscaping is lacking; clusters of large buildings face one another only to be separated by a mass of car parking, some low level shrub planting and occasional trees. Proposals need to demonstrate that the whole development can integrate within the local landscape character, not just screening the perimeter of the site from public view. The scheme appears to be resting on the perimeter planting to soften the development.
- Internal landscaping needs addressing at this stage and not through the Reserved Matters as it is key to demonstrate that the site can comfortably accommodate the size and scale of the buildings, infrastructure required and the hard and soft landscaping to integrate the site within the local landscape.
- Landscaping shown in artistic interpretations highlights that whilst landscaping may look attractive in summer months in winter, the site will appear harsh and sparse with the large buildings dominating the site.

5.4 **Trees** – Comment:

- Proposal is supported by a tree survey that sets out tree root constraints information.
- Indicative layout is respectful of constraints and allows space for retention of trees without undue impact. Proposal allows space for new tree planting.
- Detailed information will need to be provided to demonstrate how trees shown to be retained are to be protected from avoidable harm/accidental damage during construction and also sufficient detail to demonstrate that proposed tree planting can be delivered and will remain viable through to maturity without conflict with other elements of the scheme.

5.5 **Archaeology** – No comment.

“I would draw your attention to the archaeological assessment submitted with the planning application...indicates that the site has been subject to extensive past disturbance, which may have truncated or removed archaeological levels...There is no direct archaeological evidence from the site or immediate vicinity. Although some archaeological potential is inherent to this common land it is not direct or compelling.

The assessment offers no conclusion regarding the merits of any potential mitigation strategy. However on balance it is my opinion that the archaeological potential was limited, and has been extensively compromised. On that basis I would not raise any archaeological issues.”

5.6 **Highways (TVBC)**- Comment:

“In view of level of proposed development, this is one for HCC to provide the Highway Authority’s comments.”

5.7 **Highways (Hampshire County Council (HCC))** – No Objection subject to conditions and legal agreement.

Access

- Proposed to upgrade existing access arrangement onto Baddesley Road to a simple bellmouth form of access with footways into the site – confirm that the proposed access is agreed in principle and will be subject to a S.278 legal agreement.
- Noted that the access is adjacent to an existing bus stop. Given the infrequent service intervals, intensification of use of the access due to the proposed development is considered acceptable.

Trip Generation

- Existing site has been surveyed – results in a peak period flow of 21 AM peak and 10 PM peak flow with 183 daily trips.
- Proposed trip generation has been informed by experience from existing care villages using TRICS database. Forecasts peak period flows of 22 in the AM peak and 30 in the PM peak with 399 daily trips – overall trip generation of the proposed site is considered robust.
- Proposed number of trips has been discounted against the existing trips for the site to identify the net change in vehicle movements. Shows an increase in vehicle movements +1 (AM Peak), +20 (PM Peak) +216 (Daily totals).
- Community building – consider that the impact of this building on overall traffic generation is negligible.

Pedestrian and cycle access

- Adequate pedestrian infrastructure along Baddesley Road which connects with the site access.
- Adequate cycle infrastructure in the form of shared pedestrian/cycle route which is present on eastern side of Baddesley Road.
- Pedestrian and cycle facilities are considered adequate to accommodate the increase in trips from the proposed development.

Public transport provision

- Baddesley Road is served by the 46 bus service – there is a bus stop adjacent to the site. There are further bus stops located near the site which are served by services connecting to local areas.

Development impact

- Given the net trip generation it is not anticipated the development will result in a severe impact on the highway network either in capacity or safety terms.

Travel Plan

- Points in relation to the submitted Framework Travel Plan need to be addressed before it can be approved.

Recommendation

No objection subject to:

- Framework travel plan being updated in line with comments prior to completion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement and either conditions/S106 to secure:
  - Submit and implement a full Travel Plan, payment of the Travel Plan approval and monitoring fees and provision of a surety mechanism to ensure implementation of the Travel Plan.
  - Implementation of off-site highway works as shown in principle on Drawing 5303/201 Rev A.
  - Condition – Construction Traffic Management Plan.

5.8 **Ecology** – Comment:

- Development would result in a net increase in dwellings within 13.6km of the New Forest SPA – however, the proposed development would not, at this stage, appear to be of a sort where residents would be considered likely to regularly visit the New Forest to undertake activities that could cause a disturbance impact, so I am less concerned over this issue, and it would not appear that in this particular instance that the payment is required as the development would not appear to result in a likely significant effect on the New Forest when considered in combination with other plans or projects.
- Trodds Copse SSSI – A range of measures are proposed to address issues relating to potential impacts to the SSSI. Construction – phase impacts will be addressed through the implementation of a suitable Construction Method Statement (CMS) or Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The completed development will incorporate a 15m wide buffers strip between the built areas and the SSSI, while fencing, signage and new planting will prevent access/impacts within the SSSI.
- Protected and notable species - Site found to support a range of species including slow worm and grass snake. Parts of the site are well-used by foraging bats although no significant numbers of rare species were identified. A low number of breeding birds were found to be using the site. No hazel dormice were found during the survey. The proposed mitigation measures for habitats and species on site are acceptable.
- Reptiles – proposed to address impacts to reptiles by translocating them to a receptor area within the site, within the proposed 15m buffer along the boundary with the SSSI. This receptor area is currently not suitable but will be subject to enhancement measures. This is appropriate but it is noted that the establishment of suitable habitat along this strip will take some time – this will need to be programmed in. CMS/CEMP (see Natural England comments) should clearly set out timescales for this, as well as other time-dependent establishment measures for mitigation.



- External lighting – Report identifies that a detailed lighting strategy will incorporate the need to retain dark corridors – particularly the eastern stream corridor and the SSSI boundary. Maintenance of the stream corridor and the SSSI boundary would ensure maintenance of ecological linkage between Upper Flexford nature Reserve Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and the SSSI.
- Suggested conditions
  - Submission of Construction Method Statement
  - Submission of detailed external lighting plan

5.9 **Housing** – Comment:

- Planning Statement provided, page 9, states 87 extra care units made up of 68 apartments, 15 cottages and 4 bungalows however the site plan confirms 92 extra care units comprising 68 apartments, 18 cottages and 6 bungalows. Assume that the planning statement is incorrect and will need correction?

Applicant has confirmed that the description of the application shows the amount of development proposed. The planning statement is incorrect on this point.

5.10 **Environmental Protection** – Comment:

- No concerns regarding the proposed uses – reasonably satisfied with the indicative layout provided that this does not change dramatically, the relationships shown between different uses.
- Following detailed comments have been received
  - Construction noise – construction and demolition activities should be confined to suitable hours by condition.
  - Delivery noise – location and layout of delivery areas together with the provision of acoustic barriers should be subject to approval at reserved matters stage.
  - Delivery hours should be controlled by condition.
  - Community Centre – design and layout of the building should be conditioned for consideration at reserved matters stage.
  - Plant noise – location/type of any fixed plant should be conditioned.
  - Odour – odour control (from any kitchen extract system) should be conditioned.
  - Laundry – concerns in relation to location of laundry area within the care home – details should be provided at reserved matters stage.
  - Contaminated land – Condition relating to land contamination/unexpected land contamination recommended due to sensitive nature of the site and findings contained in the Phase 1 Site Investigation.

- 5.11 **Environment Agency** – No objection.
- Majority of development on site falls within Flood Zone 1 which has the lowest risk of flooding.
  - Minor part of the care home falls within Flood Zone 3. The Flood Risk Assessment proposes that the finished floor levels will be set a minimum of 33.50m AOD providing a freeboard of 1.24m above the 1 in 100 year event with the upper end climate change allowance taken into consideration.
  - Safe access and egress from this location is available.
- 5.12 **Southern Water** – Comment :
- No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 metres either side of the centreline of the public foul sewer and all existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.
  - No new soakaways, ponds, swales or other water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5m of a public sewer.
- 5.13 **Southern Gas** – No comment.
- 5.14 **Lead Local Flood Authority** – Comments:
- General principles for the surface water drainage proposals are acceptable, we would recommend that further information on the proposals be submitted as part of a more detailed design phase.
  - Important to ensure that long-term maintenance and responsibility for Sustainable Drainage Systems is agreed between the Local Planning Authority and the applicant before planning permission is granted.
  - Where the proposals are connecting to an existing drainage system it is likely that the authorities responsible for maintaining those systems will have their own design requirements which need to be reviewed and agreed as part of any surface water drainage scheme.
- 5.15 **Natural England** – No objection subject to conditions.
- Application site is immediately adjacent to Trodds Copse SSSI. Additionally the site is in close proximity to the New Forest Area of Conservation (SAC) and New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) which are European sites. The New Forest sites are also listed as New Forest Ramsar site and also notified at a national level as The New Forest SSSI.
  - The site is in close proximity to the River Itchen SSSI/SAC.
  - In advising your authority on the requirements relating to Habitats Regulations Assessment, and to assist you in screening for the likelihood of significant effects, based on the information provided, Natural England offers the following advice:
    - the proposal is not necessary for the management of the European site.
    - that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on any European site, and can therefore be screened out from any requirement for further assessment.



- River Itchen SSSI and Trodds Copse SSSI – conditions:
  - Preparation and delivery of a Construction Environmental Management programmes (CEMP)
  - Preparation and delivery of a Sustainable Drainage System (SUDs)
  - Compliance with the woodland protection recommended in the Ecological Impact Assessment
  - All those involved with the works should be informed of the status and legal obligations attached to the Trodds Copse SSSI designation and where the boundary of the protected area is.
- Conditions are required to ensure that the development, as submitted, will not impact upon the features of special interest for which Trodds Copse SSSI and River Itchen SSSI are notified.
- Protected species – refer to standing advice
- Biodiversity enhancements – Authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant if minded to grant planning permission.
- Ancient woodland – refer to standing advice.
- Local sites – Authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand impact the proposal has on local sites before it determines the application.

5.16 **John Hearn Urban Design** – Comments:

*“I have concluded that there would be an opportunity to design a C2 care facility on the site, given the fact that the land is previously developed, however, an acceptable scheme would need to have a reduced amount of accommodation at a reduced height, there should be a reduced amount of hard surfaces and an increase in the amount of space for trees and other landscaping within the body of the site. All this is necessary to ensure both the character of the area and the issues associated with the local gap are addressed.”*

5.17 **Second round of consultation in relation to the amended proposals received in February/March 2018**

5.18 **Landscape** – No objection.

- General layout is significantly better than the previous proposal.
- Reduction in height of the buildings along the east of the site will ensure the wooded backdrop is retained.
- There is significantly more space throughout the site allowing for more substantial soft landscaping to be implemented.
- Buildings to the rear of the site are shown at a higher density.
- Many of the evergreen trees along the eastern boundary will be removed and replaced as part of the management plan – although these trees are non-native they help to provide a level of mitigation between the site and Flexford Close. As part of the replacements it would be beneficial to include evergreen species to retain a level of mitigation.

- Spine road is shown as a light grey with parking areas in a light buff colour – contrasting the routes through the site with different materials will help to reduce the vast level of blacktop and enhance the overall quality of the scheme.

5.19 **Trees** – Comment:

- Submitted cross sections give rise to concerns in that they appear to indicate significant rise in ground levels in proximity to trees alongside the stream corridor – benefit would be derived from mapping proposed ground level contours with root protection areas.
- Be wary of sticking to a native palate. Increasing species diversity would be beneficial.
- Retention of and replacing an evergreen element aids diversity, year round screening and interest.
- Points raised in previous response still need to be addressed - detailed information will need to be provided to demonstrate how trees shown to be retained are to be protected from avoidable harm/accidental damage during construction and also sufficient detail to demonstrate that proposed tree planting can be delivered and will remain viable through to maturity without conflict with other elements of the scheme.

Case Officer note: The applicant has submitted amended plans in relation to the above, any further comments from the tree officer will be reported in the update paper.

5.20 **Highways (TVBC)** – Comment:

- Understand there is agreement in principle for this development to either provide or pay HCC to provide street lighting along Baddesley Road between the site and B3043 Hursley Road.

5.21 **Highways (HCC)** – No objection.

Parking and internal layout

- Full comments should be sought via our Agent at Test Valley Borough Council.

Access

- Access proposals are considered acceptable.

Trip generation and development impact

- From comparison of the current proposed development mix to the previous proposal it is clear that there will be an increase of 2 vehicular trips in both the AM and PM peak due to the additional 9 “extra care” units and a reduction of 2 trips generated in the AM peak and 1 in the PM peak due to the removal of the community centre. The affect of the proposed ‘either 65 care beds or up to 48 “extra care” units’ is that either trips will remain as previously forecast or increase by 2 trips in the AM peak and 7 trips in the PM peak – it is not considered these amendments will significantly affect the previous conclusion reached.

Given the net trip generation – it is not anticipated that the development will result in a severe impact on the highway network in either capacity or safety terms.

Pedestrian and cycle access

- There is adequate pedestrian infrastructure along Baddesley Road which connects with the site access. There is also adequate cycle infrastructure. These facilities are considered acceptable to accommodate the increase in trips from the proposed development.

Public transport provision

- Baddesley Road is served by the 46 bus service. There is a bus stop adjacent to the site. There are further bus stops located near the site (approx. 250m) which are served by services connecting to local areas.

Travel Plan

- Framework Travel Plan was agreed following the highway authority's comments dated 27<sup>th</sup> July 2017. Given a full travel plan is required it is considered acceptable that the changes in quantum/mix of accommodation is picked up within the Full Travel Plan. It will not be necessary to update the Framework Travel Plan.

Recommendation

Raise no objection to the proposal from a highways and transportation perspective, subject to the following conditions and subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following package of mitigation:

- Submit and implement a full Travel Plan, payment of the Travel Plan approval and monitoring fees and provision of a surety mechanism to ensure implementation of the Travel Plan.
- Implementation of off-site highway works as shown in principle on drawing 5303/204.

Condition: A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority in writing before development commences.

5.22 **Ecology** – Awaited (to be reported in update paper).

5.23 **Environmental protection** – No change from comments previously provided (paragraph 5.10 above).

5.24 **Environment Agency** – No objection.

- Majority of the development on the site falls within flood zone 1 which has the lowest probability of flooding.
- A minor part of the care home falls within flood zone 3 which has the highest probability of flooding.

Case Officer note: It should be noted that the amended indicative layout show the potential care home to be located wholly within Flood Zone 1 and not in Flood Zone 3 as stated by the Environment Agency.

- 5.25 **Lead Local Flood Authority** – No change from comments previously provided (paragraph 5.14 above).
- 5.26 **Natural England** – Awaited (to be reported in update paper).
- 5.27 **Eastleigh Borough Council** – Comments:
- Application site lies very close to the Borough boundary with Eastleigh.
  - Concerns in respect of the likely traffic generation and associated highway impacts within this area as a result of the proposed development particularly in respect of the possible extra traffic travelling through North Millers Dale, as well as along Baddesley Road to the traffic lights with Hursley Road/Hiltingbury Road and along Winchester and Bournemouth Roads to the M3.
  - “Core facilities” should be clearly defined and their use controlled in any Section 106 agreement. Any ancillary retail outlet on the site should be for site residents only, restricted in size, and not located on the boundary with Baddesley Road.
  - Concerns are raised in respect of potential sewage capacity. If approved, it is essential that any mitigation includes infrastructure projects and/or their funding within Eastleigh Borough area and we would invite dialogue in this respect.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS – First round in relation to the original proposals submitted on 26.06.2017 Expired 24.11.2017**

- 6.1 **Ampfield Parish Council** – No objection (comments summarised below):
- Noted the removal of the shop has resulted in a more sylvan appearance at the entrance with Baddesley Road. Committee also observed that most of the fields to the south of Trodds Copse were now not part of the proposed development.
  - Concern raised about the positioning of the boundary fencing between the development and Trodds Copse. Suggested that the fencing, rather than being on the boundary of the development should be nearer the buildings thus allowing the “separation space” to become natural habitat.
  - Suggested by some that Officers consider not allowing Care Village residents to have perhaps dogs but especially cats with them. Perhaps this might be considered and achieved through leasing arrangements? This would maintain the Trodds Copse natural environment, especially for ground nesting birds.
  - The Ampfield Village Design Statement is an important supplementary planning document on page 2 it states:

*“...attract younger people to the village and enable older residents to stay by encouraging the provision, when the opportunity arises, of appropriately sized housing for them and the facilities that they need.”*

- In the latest questionnaire (2017) sent to all residents in the Parish, the question was asked: Do you agree or disagree with the following statement about business in Ampfield?

*“I would welcome more opportunity for care for the elderly within the parish”*

In reply 52.5% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed. 35.9% expressed no opinion with only 11.1% disagreeing.

- Thus we conclude that the majority of residents, expressing a view, were in favour of this type of development.

## 6.2 **Romsey and District Society** – Comments:

- Similar comments as given to previous application (17/00616/OUTS) but concerns on that application have generally been overcome in the present proposals.
- Noted that the site lies within the countryside and the local gap as shown in the Revised Local Plan – acknowledged that a significant part of the application area is a brownfield site with its various uses on the land. To this extent this material consideration gave way to some acceptance of the outline scheme for residential development although the extent of any loss of local amenity by the existence of the on-site uses was not known.

## 6.3 **6 x letters** OBJECTING to the proposals on the following grounds (summarised):

### Principle

- Application does not conform to the NPPF Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development para 12 because the application does not accord with TVBC’s up-to-date 2016 Local Plan; in fact it directly conflicts with the Local Plan and must therefore be refused.
- Application does not conform to policy COM2 – it is not located in a settlement boundary and is therefore countryside. No justification or mitigating circumstances have been offered for why it is essential for this application to be located in the Countryside.
- Application conflicts with policies COM8, COM9, COM10, COM11, COM12, COM13, COM14, LE10, LE16, LE17 and LE18
- The Adopted Local Plan and associated documents do not specify a need for further Care facilities. If there was a need, this should have been identified in the SHMA. If the applicant insists there is a need then one has to conclude the Adopted Local Plan is either already out of date leading to more speculative applications or should have been found unsound.

### Local Gap

- Application is located within a Local Gap and there is a contravention of policy E3. No justification or mitigation circumstances have been offered for why it is essential for this application to be located in a Local Gap.

### Ecology

- Development is adjacent to Trodds Copse. A mere 15m strip gives no protection for the flora and fauna in the SSSI which at the moment is a quiet and isolated spot.
- Noise from road in the north-west corner of the site will disturb Trodds Copse along with the path/dog walk/cycle way/scooter way right against the proposed narrow buffer zone.
- Proposed buildings (apartment blocks, bungalows/cottages) are all too close to Trodds Copse and would be detrimental to the Copse.
- Light pollution and noise will disturb wildlife which will subsequently be lost.
- In the sad event that these plans are passed, can only hope that the fence guarding Trodds Copse and the meadow would be a 100% barrier to humans, dogs and cats.
- There is no fencing between the buildings and the buffer zone – means that the buffer zone is open to people – a fence impenetrable to humans, dogs and cats that only allow access for management of the buffer zone should be provided.
- The application should be refused on the grounds of policy E5, the site is adjacent to Emer Bog a Site of Special Scientific Interest. No justification or mitigating circumstances have been offered for why it is essential for this application to be located next to a SSSI.

### Amenity

- Development would impact on numbers 49-65 Flexford Close in respect of overlooking and wholly inappropriate “landscaping” which will create a permanent rat reservation on my doorstep and cause excessive shading, loss of daylight, moss, growth and leaves.
- There would be a degree of overlooking of Flexford Close properties by the proposed development even if the buildings are two-storeys in height due to the ground levels of the site.
- Rats will be displaced – steep bank created by previous fly tipping will provide an ideal habitat for these rats.
- Flexford Close already suffers from excessive shading cause by the trees on the site – suggests that the landscaping/screening plan should involve the removal of the steep bank from the Brook and the existing trees and their replacement by a gently sloping rough area with thick deciduous bushes to the height of the proposed buildings’ gutters.
- Note there are no proposals for the management of the narrow strip of land on the Flexford Close side of the Brook opposite the proposed development. Suggest that its management should be entrusted to its adjoining owners to prevent currently unforeseen future problems.
- Concerns that the proposed care home would dominate the neighbouring dwelling at 21 Flexford Close.
- In favour of the developer being asked to make provision for dealing with smells from proposed kitchen areas.



Landscaping

- No in favour of planting more Alder trees due to issues with Alder Beetles. Would instead favour evergreen trees such as holly rather than deciduous trees.
- Conifers currently present many problems being unstable in high winds and have fallen on neighbouring properties on more than one occasion. They also create excessive debris in neighbouring gardens and gutters.

Implications on character and appearance

- Loss of winter storage of small caravans would result in a rash of caravans in front gardens.

Other matters

- Loss of the recycling of building materials is regrettable now Council tips have reduced opening hours and introduced charges.
- Perhaps a compromise can be made by moving the storage of caravans to the rear of the site and using the front of the site for a more modest (perhaps part charitable) care home complex.
- Will anything be done by Southern Water to alleviate problems with smells from the existing sewage pumping station?

6.4 **REPRESENTATIONS – Second round in relation to the amended proposals received in February/March 2018** Expired 30.04.2018

6.5 **Ampfield Parish Council – No objection:**

Additional comments to those contained in original response (paragraph 6.1 above).

- Concern raised at the meeting by a member of the public regarding lack of boundary fencing between the development and Trodds Copse – suggested that this would allow too easy access to the SSSI from the development.
- Ampfield Parish Council (APC) Committee noted that the number of residences has increased and that the type of building has changed from individual residences to two storey apartment blocks. Whilst the main building has been moved away from Flexford Close, these two storey apartment blocks will create a significant structural imposition on houses in the Close as they will be more dominant, particularly as the sun moves towards the west.
- Noted by a member of the public that the latest proposal shows an increase in the number of car parking spaces. In particular questions were asked about the proposal to position 12 car parking spaces under on the main buildings. Why is this necessary and will it increase the risk of flood damage?
- Although HCC Highways have stated that the increase in traffic will be minimal, we understand that, linked to this application, there is a proposal to provide street lighting on Baddesley Road. Ampfield is a rural parish and in our view, the provision of new street lighting will seriously damage the characteristic of the Parish. This is set out in the new Village Design Statement. APC are thus against such a proposal.

- Argue that any on-site lighting should be at low level, thus minimising its impact.
- Draw to the attention of the Planning Officer on site lighting at Morley's Green – provided at approximately 1m. This we would argue to be sufficient for all needs on the site and would prevent it being "lit-up" in what we consider to be a rural environment.

6.6 **Valley Park Parish Council** – Support.

*"Valley Park Parish Council would like to support this application, in particular the lighting scheme for safety reasons for the present residents and the new residents of the new care complex."*

6.7 **2 x letters** OBJECTING to the proposals on the following grounds (summarised):

Principle

- Applicant is still attempting to overturn policies in the Test Valley Adopted Local Plan 2011-2019
- Site does not feature in the current SHLAA and sits in designated Countryside and a Local Gap.
- Applicant is claiming 63% of the site is man made yet the site is not listed in the Test Valley classified Brownfield Register. NPPF defines brownfield sites (or previously developed land) as land which has already been built on and either currently contains building/structures, or has done so in the recent past.
- Brownfield sites do not include land occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings, land where previous development have blended into the landscape. To be included sites must also be available for residential development and suitable for residential development in accordance with policies contained in the Local Plan and the NPPF free from adverse impact on the natural environment, habitats or built heritage that cannot be mitigated.
- On the one hand the applicant is saying the site is build land [sic] even though it is not considered as brownfield. On the other hand they are saying you cannot see it anyway so what is the problem.
- Just because you cannot see a development behind a screen of vegetation is not enough, it is still in a Local Gap.
- The Local Plan was pushed through by then Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning, Cllr Martin Hatley. This site is owned by Cllr Hatley's family. A conflict of interests and double standards are clearly at work here. Absolutely disgraceful that a Borough Councillor can push through a Local Plan and within a year have an application on land he and his family own that breaks policies within the Local Plan.

Ecology

- Applicant is saying the SSSI will not be impacted because it cannot be accessed or even seen by the public. Surely constructing buildings within metres of a SSSI will have an impact on the site. Proximity of development to a SSSI is important to the wildlife which will be impacted.



- Northern edge of the development is still adjacent to Trodds Copse. A 15m strip gives no protection for the flora and fauna in the SSSI.
- There is still no protection for this inadequate buffer zone. There is no fence between the buildings and the buffer zone. Means that the buffer zone is open to people, visitors, grandchildren, dog walkers, cyclists, wheelchair users etc. A fence that is impenetrable to humans, dogs and cats between the buildings and the buffer zone is needed.
- Density of building to the north of the site nearest to Trodds Copse seems to be increased. Light and noise pollution from the buildings and cars will disturb wildlife in Trodds Copse which would result in the loss of wildlife.
- Proposals would disturb the water table in Trodds Copse. This, together with run-of pollution will have further implications for the stream that is on the north eastern side of the site as it passes under Baddesley Road and into Flexford Nature Reserve.

#### General

- Application still conflicts with policies COM8 to COM14, LE10, LE16-LE18.

#### 6.8 **1 x letter neither objecting to or supporting the proposals:**

- Generally plans have been revised in a positive way. Pleased the larger buildings with associated parking and deliveries have been re-sited further away which addresses concerns regarding noise and height of the buildings.
- Smaller buildings along the eastern boundary have been moved closer to the stream – height is greater than the properties in Flexford Close which are negatives.
- Concerned that the trees suggested to replace the conifers over the two year period are all deciduous and will therefore only screen the development for part of the year and continue to cause properties along the stream a lot of work in the autumn clearing the leaves and debris.
- Already highlighted problems with existing Alders which we would like to see removed. Field Maple and Oak are good choices. White and Crack Willow are large and known for shedding branches which are likely to fall onto our property, neither sound very suitable. Lime – please don't plant them where leaves can get blown onto cars in Flexford Close – they are known to damage paintwork.
- Local trees would be better, suggestions include Holly, Wild Cherry, Hawthorn, Blackthorn, Goat Willow, Hazel, Silver Birch, Bay tree, Laurel tree.
- Would very much welcome a more neighbourly interest in the maintenance of the riverbank.

#### 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)

COM1 – Housing Provision 2011-2029

COM2 – Settlement hierarchy

COM15 – Infrastructure

LE10 – Retention of land and strategic employment sites

LE17 – Existing employment sites in the countryside

E1 – High quality development in the Borough

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

E3 – Local Gaps

E5 – Biodiversity

E7 – Water management

E8 – Pollution

E9 – Heritage

LHW4 – Amenity

T1 – Managing movement

T2 – Parking standards

## 7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

- Ampfield Village Design Statement (VDS)
- Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

## 8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### 8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development including loss of existing employment site
- Economic impacts
- Affordable housing
- Amount of Development and Impact surrounding landscape character, Local Gap and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Impact on neighbour amenities
- Ecology
- Highways
- Flooding and drainage
- Ground contamination
- Archaeology
- The Planning Balance

### 8.2 **The principle of development**

#### Barn store/offices

The proposal involves the erection of a single storey store/barn which would serve Wheelhouse Park. The barn would be sited adjacent to the mobile home site and would be located in a countryside location as defined by the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 (RLP). Policy COM2 of the RLP only allows development in the countryside where the proposal is

considered to be of a type appropriate for such a location (as defined in the other policies of the RLP –COM2(a)) or if there is an essential need for the proposal to be located in the countryside(COM2(b)). In this instance, the proposed development is not considered to be of a type where a countryside location is considered appropriate as defined by other policies within the RLP. Whether there is an essential need for the store/barn to be located in the countryside is discussed in the following paragraph.

8.3 The applicant has confirmed that the provision of a building, on site is essential for the day-to-day running of the mobile home park and surrounding land/livestock activities. The proposed building would be used to store feed, agricultural equipment, along with materials used to maintain the mobile home park such as materials for plumbing, electrical, decorating, drainage etc. Equipment stored in the building would include trailers, mowers, strimmers, blowers, digger, dumper, roller etc. This equipment is needed for emergency and regular maintenance work to be carried out on the mobile homes within Wheelhouse Park and is currently stored in buildings on the existing site which would be replaced by the proposed care village. It is therefore considered that should the care village proposals be considered acceptable, there would be an essential need for a storage building in relation to Wheelhouse Park. This aspect of the scheme is therefore considered acceptable in principle under COM2 of the RLP if the care village scheme is granted permission.

8.4 Loss of existing employment site

Policy LE10 of the RLP seeks to retain employment land within the Borough. On existing and allocated employment sites, development for an alternative use will be permitted provided that:

- a) the land is no longer required to meet economic development needs of the area; or
- b) the current activity is causing or could cause significant harm to the character of the area or the amenities of the residents; and
- c) it would not have a significant detrimental impact on the operation of the remaining occupiers of the site.

8.5 The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing employment site (part of the site was issued a certificate of lawful development for existing B1, B2 and B8 uses at the site). The applicant has submitted information which seeks to address the criteria of policy LE10 and to demonstrate compliance with this policy.

8.6 Land is no longer required to meet economic development needs of the area (LE10(a))

The applicant considers that the current use of the land is not required to meet the economic development needs of the area as the site represents a piece of land where items are stored and where there are approximately 5 full time equivalent (FTE) jobs. The applicant has submitted an economic impact report which seeks to demonstrate that the proposed care village would have significant benefits to the local economy (this is discussed further at paragraph 8.33). Notwithstanding this, the site has not been marketed for its

current uses and so it is not clear whether there is any demand for the existing B uses on the site (either for the existing uses or different uses within Classes B1, B2 and B8). It is also not clear whether the continuation/intensification of the existing uses could provide benefits to the economy which are similar to the proposed care village. As a result, the Local Planning Authority cannot satisfactorily conclude that the land is no longer required for economic development needs. The proposals do not therefore meet the requirement of policy LE10 (a).

8.7 *Current activity is causing or could cause significant harm to the character of the area or the amenities of the residents (LE10(b))*

The applicant considers that the current activity causes visual harm to the character and amenity of the area. The items currently stored on the site can be seen from public vantage points as well as from neighbouring residential properties and they are considered to be uncharacteristic in this rural area.

8.8 There could also be ecological impacts of continuing the existing uses at the site. The site is adjacent to Trodds Copse SSSI and Monks Brook. At present, there are no restrictions over the type of items that can be stored on site or the type of operation (under the use classes lawfully permitted) that can be carried out. There is no surface water drainage strategy, nor has consideration been given to the amount of hardstanding. There is the potential that the operations carried out on the site could give rise to environmental impacts on adjacent receptors.

8.9 In addition to the above, the applicant recognises that as the site has a lawful B1, B2 and B8 use and that there should be consideration on impacts that could arise in the future from such uses (as required by LE10(b)). The lawful uses on the site are unrestricted and as such, there could be additional significant harm to the amenities of residents, as well as the character of the area in the future. The applicant has recognised the following issues:

- Detrimental impact on visual amenity by way of a significant increase in the intensity of the use of the site – there would be nothing to prevent larger/taller objects from being stored at the site. There is space for substantially more containers on the site which could be stacked and taller vehicles/equipment (e.g. mobile cranes) could also be stored on-site.
- Significant noise and disturbance by way of a change/extension of the hours of use of the site – There are no planning controls that would present a significant increase in the delivery and collection of various items on the site, as well as the lawful light industrial or general industrial uses operating at unsocial hours. There would also be nothing to prevent, for example, general industrial uses taking place at any time of day, or a different type of storage and distribution that could operate from the site 24 hours a day.
- Impacts relating to noise and disturbance, as well as highway safety by way of a significant increase in traffic movements to and from the site – a significant increase in traffic movements could arise with no opportunity to control in planning terms.

- 8.10 The information submitted by the applicant is considered to demonstrate that whilst the existing lawful uses of the site are not currently causing significant harm to the amenities of the area, there is potential that the continued operation of the site under the unrestricted lawful uses could result in significant harm to the character of the area and the amenities of local residents. As a result, it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with policy LE10 (b) of the RLP.
- 8.11 *It would not have a significant detrimental impact on the operation of the remaining occupiers of the site (LE10 (c))*  
The proposal would remove all existing businesses/storage facilities on the site. The applicant has confirmed that the existing occupiers of the site have either secured alternative premises to continue their operations, or are choosing to retire. The proposals are not therefore considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the operation of the remaining occupiers of the site and as such, it is considered that the proposals comply with policy LE10 (c) of the RLP.
- 8.12 *Loss of employment – Summary*  
In order to comply with policy LE10, the application has to comply with either point (a) or point (b). The proposal must also comply with point (c). The above paragraphs demonstrate that the current activity could cause significant harm to the character of the area and the amenities of surrounding area. As a result, it is considered that the application complies with policy LE10(b). The applicant has also demonstrated that the proposals would not result in a significant detrimental impact on the operation of the remaining occupiers of the site in compliance with LE10 (c). As a result, it is considered that the proposals comply with policy LE10. This weighs in favour of the scheme.
- 8.13 *Care village*  
As above, the site is situated in a countryside location as defined by the RLP. With regards to compliance with policy COM2, there are no other policies within the RLP which consider this type of development to be appropriate in the countryside. As a result, the proposals are considered to be contrary to policy COM2(a). With regards to whether there is an essential need for the proposal to be located in the countryside (COM2(b)), it is considered that the applicant has submitted sufficient information to demonstrate that there is an essential need for the proposal to be located in the countryside. This is discussed further in the following paragraphs.
- 8.14 *Need for the development*  
Policy COM1 of the RLP sets the minimum housing requirement for the Borough over the plan period. The supporting text at paragraph 5.31 of the RLP states that new homes 'should provide a mix of sizes and types to meet the demographic changes of the Borough and the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)'. It also goes on to state that the SHMA identified a need for a variety of house types, as well as a number of household groups which may have particular housing needs, including 'Older People'.

8.15 The need for housing for older people is supported by paragraph 5.33 of the RLP which states that to help support older people, there will be an increased demand in ‘housing specifically designed to meet the needs of older people’ and that the Council will consider proposals positively if they help meet the Council’s Housing Strategy aims. This is supported by paragraph 50 of the NPPF, which states that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should plan for a mix of housing ‘based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community’, including older people.

8.16 The application is supported by a Planning Need Assessment (Carterwood, June 2017). Nationally, the report sets out that the UK population is set to age dramatically with a substantial increase in the number of people living to over the age of 85. The report states that approximately 31% of existing care home provision is not to the standard required to cope with the needs and expectations of today’s elderly care home residents.

8.17 The report assesses the need for both the care home and extra care elements of the proposed development.

8.18 *Care home*

To define a care home, the report uses the definition set out in Section 3 of the Care Standards Act 2000. This defines a care home as:

*“any home which provides accommodation together with nursing or personal care for any person who is or has been ill (including mental disorder), is disabled or infirm, or who has past or present dependence on drugs or alcohol.”*

The report explains that care homes are highly regulated by the Care Quality Commission (CQC), which is responsible for registering and monitoring care homes across all sectors as well as other care providers such as domiciliary care agencies.

8.19 In assessing the need for the proposed care home, the report has looked at the supply and demand position by looking at different areas surrounding the site, these being:

- Market catchment area – 5 mile radius of the site which reflects ‘the high levels of accessibility and mixed rural and suburban surrounding areas’.
- Local market catchment area – 2 mile radius of the site
- Test Valley Borough Council local authority area.

The need assessment also looks at demographic changes within the area along with planned developments for care homes that have been granted permission within the last 3 years (both within and outside of the market catchment area).



8.20 The need assessment also assesses the total provision of market standard beds. These are bedrooms operated by each care home that provide en-suite facilities (defined as providing a WC and wash hand basin and does not necessarily provide shower/bathing facilities).

8.21 The assessment within the report indicates that there is a shortfall of 323 market standard bedspaces within the market catchment area and 6 within Test Valley. This figure assumes that all planned bedrooms are developed and operational (provision in 2018). When taking into account that not all planned beds show signs of imminent development, the report states that a more realistic assessment indicates larger shortfalls of 544 in the market catchment area and 27 within Test Valley.

8.22 *Extra care units*

The report explains that it is difficult to define this type of accommodation however, the Department of Health (DoH) has identified three common features which are as follows:

- It is first and foremost a type of residential accommodation. It is a person's own home. It is not a care home or a hospital and this is reflected in the nature of its occupancy through ownership whether it be lease or tenancy.
- It is accommodation that has been specifically designed, built or adapted to facilitate the care and support needs of its owners or tenants
- Access to care and support is available 24 hours per day.

The report goes on to explain that extra care schemes, providing 24-hour on-site support, fall within Class C2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2015 (as amended) as they provide both accommodation and care/support on a 24-hour/day basis.

8.23 In assessing the need for the proposed extra-care units, the report looks at existing facilities within a 7.5 mile radius (market catchment). In clarifying this, the report states:

*"The decision to enter an extra care scheme is choice rather than need driven. Hence people are willing to travel much further to find an extra care scheme that meets their demands than they are to find an appropriate care home."*

The assessment takes into account planned provision of this type of accommodation. This includes sites that are proposed for development as well as those that have planning permission within the areas specified.

8.24 The initial assessment within the report indicates that there is a shortfall of 711 private, extra care units within the market catchment area and 53 within Test Valley. This is taking into account planned provision. However, when taking into account extra care units that are either under construction or have a high likelihood of imminent development are included, it has been indicated that there is a 1,130 unit shortfall within the market catchment area and 322 unit shortfall within Test Valley.



- 8.25 The submitted need assessment indicates that there is a shortfall in terms of both care home beds and extra care units both within the market catchments of the site and within Test Valley as a whole. This demonstrates a significant undersupply of both types of accommodation. This undersupply has to be considered in parallel to demographic changes and an understanding on what the application proposes in terms of accommodation to determine whether the development would meet this need.
- 8.26 The Council's SHMA (Jan 2014) identifies that there has been an increase in the over 60's bracket of the population since 2001, indicating a strong trend towards an ageing population within the Borough. This trend is noticeable in the Romsey area in particular, with the SHMA reporting that approximately 22% of the population is aged over 65, indicating an increasing need for older persons' accommodation in the local area.
- 8.27 The PPG states that 'the need to provide housing for older people is critical given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over accounts for over half of the new households' and that 'supporting independent living can help to reduce the costs to health and social services, and providing more options for older people to move could also free up houses that are under occupied', (ref: 2a-021-20160401).
- 8.28 The application seeks planning permission for the creation of a care village. The supporting information submitted with the application states that the care village would provide accommodation for older people who have varying requirements for care. The extra care units will be provided on the basis of accommodation with direct access to communal facilities and a 'care package' being required by the occupant and being available on-site. The proposed care home will cater for people in greater need of full time care. The applicant confirms that both the care home and the extra care units would fall into a C2 use class and is willing to enter into a legal agreement which would set down occupation restrictions. In relation to the extra care units, occupation restrictions would be set down by confirming a basic care package the future occupiers of these units would need to adhere to before moving into the scheme.
- 8.29 At the time of writing this report, specific details in relation to the minimum care package were not finalised however, any legal agreement would cover the following, general restrictions:
- Availability of care staff on-site 24 hours a day to provide emergency cover
  - On site security
  - Requirement of a minimum amount of care to be provided on a weekly basis.
  - Availability of meals
  - Opportunity to participate in events organised by the person or body operating care facilities at the site
  - Access to and use of community facility
  - Further care and support services as may be required from time to time.

The agreement of a minimum care package would ensure that the extra care units would remain in a C2 use.

8.30 Other benefits of the proposals

The information submitted by the applicant states that the proposals would offer other benefits and these must be taken into account in the determination of the application. The other benefits provided by the proposals are outlined as follows:

- Location of the site – the Carterwood report explains that the site has good road and rail connections. It is also noted that bus stops are located on Baddesley Road, adjacent to the site.
- Benefits to the housing market – “People moving into a care village will release larger family homes back into the community”
- Creation of a social ‘hub’ – the proposals would create a hub which will fulfil an increasing need for older people living locally to the site, in addition to those living within the care village. Such facilities can be available for use by healthcare professionals to provide surgeries and consultations for both residents and those in the wider community. The requirement to enable local older people having access to the community facility proposed on the site can be required through the S106 agreement.
- Impacts on the wider community – Wider community benefits include faster discharges from hospital and benefits to families in relieving them of the pressure to care.
- Social Inclusion – It is widely recognised that older age groups with reduced mobility increasingly suffer from social exclusion. Care villages can offer opportunities for both companionship and social interaction which can occur both formally within organised clubs or activities and informally within communal areas. This can have consequent benefits to health, well-being, and quality of life.

In addition to the need for the proposals, these benefits must weigh in favour of the proposed development.

8.31 Need – Summary

The information submitted by the applicant has demonstrated that there is an essential need for the proposed use in both the market area and Test Valley as a whole. It is clear that the proposed development would help in meeting this growing need as well as help to achieve the aims of both local and national policy in providing housing for groups which have a particular housing need, in this case, for older people in accordance with policy COM1 of the RLP and guidance within the NPPF. It is considered that the information submitted by the applicant demonstrates that there is an essential need for the proposed development in this location in accordance with policy COM2(b) of the RLP.

8.32 Principle of development summary

To summarise the above, the principle of the proposed barn store/offices is considered acceptable under policy COM2(b) of the RLP. It is considered that the loss of the existing employment use of the site is acceptable under policy LE10(b) of the RLP and that the re-development of the site as a care village

is acceptable under policy COM2(b) of the RLP. As such, provided the proposed development complies with the other relevant policies contained within the RLP, the proposed re-development of the site is considered acceptable in principle.

**8.33 Economic impacts**

The application is supported by an Economic Impact Report (EIR – Pegasus Group, February 2018) which includes details of the potential economic benefits of the proposed development during both the construction and operational phase of the development.

**8.34 Construction phase benefits**

The EIR estimates that the proposed scheme could support around 281 temporary roles per annum during the anticipated 2 year construction programme. This figure includes both jobs created on site and in the wider economy as construction would have knock-on effects for other sectors which leads to increased demand for building materials and equipment, as well as domestic furniture and carpets etc.

8.35 The EIR states that another way of looking at the economic contribution of the construction phase is to calculate the contribution a development makes to wealth creation, as measured by the increase in the value of goods and services generated within an area. The EIR has calculated this by looking at the increase in gross added value (GVA). The EIR has used data produced by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) which enables the calculation of GVA per employee by sector at regional level. In the south east, the GVA per employee in the construction industry is estimated to be around £79,000 per annum. Total annual GVA per employee for all sections in the region is estimated at £60,000.

8.36 When applying these GVA figures to the employment estimates above, the EIR estimates that the development could generate an additional £18.8 million of GVA per annum during the two-year construction phase.

**8.37 Operational phase benefits (permanent jobs impact)**

The EIR states that jobs at the proposed care village are likely to be in a variety of roles and are likely to include:

- Carers
- Managers
- Gardeners
- Caterers

It is estimated that approximately 45-50 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs could be created by the proposals (taking into account leakage, displacement and multiplier effects). The EIR states that currently, 5 FTE jobs are supported on the site. The EIR concludes:

***“Taking the net jobs associated with the reference case (existing site) away from the employment supported by the intervention case (proposed development), the proposed care village is estimated to create approximately 40-45 net additional FTE jobs in the Test Valley economy.”***

8.38 Contribution to economic output

The EIR estimates that the proposed development would contribute an additional £1.4 - £1.6 million in economic output to the Test Valley economy per annum. Looking at the economic output over a longer timeframe, the EIR estimates that over a ten-year period the scheme is estimated to generate an additional £12.4 - £14.1 million in economic output.

8.39 The estimated job creation and economic output is considered a benefit of the proposals and weighs in favour of the scheme.

8.40 **Affordable Housing**

Consideration must be given to the requirement for and delivery of affordable housing provision associated with the proposed development. Policy COM7 of the RLP relates to the provision of affordable housing and states that on sites with a net gain of 15 units or more, the Council will seek 40% affordable housing provision. However, based on the C2 use of the proposed development, there would be no affordable housing requirement in this instance and the Housing Officer has raised no objection to the proposals on these grounds.

8.41 **Amount of Development and impact surrounding landscape character, Local Gap and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

The application seeks permission in outline with detailed permission being sought for scale and access. An indicative layout has been submitted with the application which seeks to demonstrate that the amount of development, at the scale proposed could be satisfactorily accommodated on the site without there being harm to the character and appearance of the area and specifically, the local gap.

8.42 Existing site context

The site currently contains low level storage including containers, caravans, vehicles (including double decker buses) and some inert materials. There are a few small single storey buildings and a wider span single storey corrugated iron clad building towards the centre of the site. The site slopes down from the west towards Monks Brook. The site is adjacent to Wheelhouse Park to the west. Wheelhouse Park is a residential area consisting of single storey park homes which sits on elevated land. Wheelhouse park is separated from the site by an evergreen boundary hedge on top of a bank.

8.43 The site is separated from Flexford Close to the east by Monks Brook and a substantial tree belt. Flexford Close is a residential area consisting of two storey residential dwellings. Trodds Copse is located to the north west of the site. To the south, on the opposite side of Baddesley Road lies Flexford Nature Reserve.

8.44 Due to the relatively low height of the items being stored on the site, views of the tall, surrounding woodland, including Trodds Copse are maintained. Whilst the site has an industrial nature the rural characteristics of the site are considered to be maintained.

8.45 Urban Design Appraisal

To assist in understanding the context of the site and whether the re-development of the site would be appropriate considering its countryside location, within a designated local gap, an urban design appraisal was commissioned by Officers. The appraisal was undertaken by an urban design consultant and was based on the indicative layout as originally submitted (June 2017). This appraisal raised some concerns over the original indicative layout submitted mainly in terms of the amount of development proposed and where it was located within the site. Specifically, there were concerns that due to the height of the buildings (2.5 – 3 storeys) and the location of the largest building (care home), to the front of the site, the proposals would not be sympathetic to the rural character of the surrounding area. The main points within the appraisal in relation to the indicative layout as originally submitted are summarised below:

- There is too much development proposed on the site...if developed this way, would result in a development which will appear as an extension to the settlement of Hocombe and would appear as a development with a distinctive suburban character which would be unsympathetic to the rural character of the local gap.
- A number of buildings are too high being 2.5-3 storeys – would be clearly higher than the mobile homes, even though the mobile homes are on higher land. Heights of the care home and 3 storey extra care apartments are higher than the properties in Flexford Close (i.e. development within the settlement boundary and clearly of a suburban character).
- The height and mass of the care home will be a dominant feature as you move along Baddesley Road, south west to north east. Visually this building will have more focus and prominence in views than the landscape that will frame it. From this view, the character of development on this side of Baddesley Road will change from a rural character to suburban, built up character. Also, on entering the development, the large mass of the care home (12 metres to ridge) and 3 storey extra care apartments will again appear suburban in character.
- If another layout was proposed with the same amount and height of development, in my view, it would not be possible to achieve anything other than a development which has a suburban character.
- Because of the scale of the buildings, the amount of development proposed and the amount of hard surfaces and car parking, it will not appear as a low density development consistent with a rural location. It will not result in a 'village setting' or a 'bespoke village layout' as asserted by the applicant. Instead it will appear as a dense large scale development which will significantly diminish the rural spatial characteristics of the area.

On what would be acceptable on the site, the appraisal advises:

- It would be possible to design a C2 development for the site.



- Less development on the site would allow lower buildings (maximum 2 storey), which would be much less visible in views from Baddesley Road and less dominant as you enter the site and moved through it. A lower density would allow a more sympathetic layout which would provide more space between buildings or between linked building, which could provide for soft landscaping and much more native tree planting within the body of the site. Lower density development will mean a reduced number of car parking spaces which, with careful design, could be integrated successfully within a strong landscape framework and allow a number of car parking areas to be concealed from public view.

The main points to be taken from the appraisal are quoted as follows:  
*“It would therefore be contrary to policy to support a development on the site which was significantly visible from the public realm of Baddesley Road which has suburban characteristics in terms of the scale of buildings, the spaces between them and the amount of hard standing, as this would have the effect of extending the settlement of Hocombe into the countryside and would change the rural character of part of the area.”*

*“Given the lawful business use of the site and the current physical and visual characteristics of the site, it would not be unreasonable to consider favourably some development on the site. This would likely be the case if an intensification of business use was to be proposed.”*

8.46 Proposed revised indicative layout

In response to the urban design appraisal the applicant has amended the indicative layout as follows:

- Scale of development in relation to building heights has been addressed along Baddesley Road. The 3-storey element has been re-sited to the centre of the site, being less visible from the site entrance and frontage. Buildings towards the front of the site are now 2 storeys in height and are set back from the site's entrance.
- Proposed development to the rear of the site is visually separated from development to the front by the central green. Development to the rear of the site is two-storey in height and is denser than development to the front of the site.
- A parameters plan has been submitted with the application showing what type/scale of development should be provided in what area.

8.47 The proposed indicative layout shows that the proposed development would be provided within the following building types:

- Care home/core building – 2.5/3 storey
- Extra care apartment s– 2 storey x 10 blocks
- Single story building which would provide a barn/store for Wheelhouse Park

The indicative layout also shows a potential internal road layout, parking and recreational space, parking is proposed to be interspaced with landscaping. The site has been laid out with a main spine road going through the centre of the site. The spine road is bordered by two storey buildings towards the front

of the site (adjacent Baddesley Road) with an area of recreational space (central green) including two existing Oak trees towards the centre of the site. The larger, 'core' building would be located towards the rear of the site, along with further 2 storey extra care apartment blocks. The indicative layout shows that development would be set back from the entrance into the care village, leaving an 'entrance green' to the front.

8.48 Whilst landscaping details will be left to a reserved matters application, in order to demonstrate that the site has the capacity for the proposed development and to demonstrate that the amount of development proposed in the description can be satisfactorily integrated within the surrounding area, the applicant has submitted a landscape strategy.

8.49 *Impact on the Local Gap and landscape character of the area*

The site, along with the adjacent mobile home sites, is located within the Ampfield-Chandlers Ford/Valley Park Local Gap. Local Gaps are designated to prevent coalescence between urban areas allowing a clear visual and physical break in the built environment. The Council's 'Policy E3: Local Gaps Topic Paper' (June 2014) describes the gap as follows:

*“This gap is an area of farmland which extends north west/south east between Ampfield and Valley Park. The western boundary is formed by a collection of field boundaries and vegetated features. The gap sits almost wholly in the northern sections of landscape character area LCT2B North Baddesley and Chilworth Woodland Mosaic. The northern part of area LCT2B is well wooded but woodland clearance has been carried out to form groups of larger fields which form larger open areas within the woodland framework. Here the shallow ridges and valleys that shape the gently undulating landform make up a series which run in parallel, predominantly east west between Ampfield and Chilworth. The area is mostly undeveloped with few farmsteads.”*

The Topic Paper goes onto say that views across the gap are predominantly rural and that ridges and woodland within the gap act together to maintain visual separation between settlements. Ridges and woodland also provide a settling to each settlement.

8.50 Policy E3 of the RLP allows development within Local Gaps provided that:

- a) it would not diminish the physical separation and/or visual separation; and
- b) it would not individually or cumulatively with other existing or proposed development compromise the integrity of the gap.

Policy E3 does not prevent all development within a local gap but seeks to ensure that a 'sense of place is maintained for both those individual communities and for those travelling through the defined gaps'.



- 8.51 Considering the existing character of the site, the buildings/structures contained on it and the lawful use of part of it, it is reasonable to conclude that the site could be re-developed in a way that would not further diminish the physical and visual separation within the Ampfield-Chandlers Ford Local Gap. The levels of the site and boundary vegetation ensure that it is fairly well contained within both the surrounding landscape and within the Local Gap. The site is well screened from the surrounding area by both boundary and surrounding vegetation much of which is proposed to be maintained and enhanced by the proposed development.
- 8.52 Due to the visual containment of the site outlined above, the most visible aspect of it is from Baddesley Road and as such, this is considered to be the most sensitive public viewpoint of the site, where any proposed development would be most noticeable. Existing structures and vehicles/caravans stored within the site are visible from the access point and through gaps in the hedge which fronts Baddesley Road. As such, the site, as existing, includes physical features which result in some diminishment of the Local Gap.
- 8.53 The indicative layout plan and accompanying parameter plan shows that development to the front of the site, adjacent to Baddesley Road, would be restricted to being two storeys in height. In addition, development to the front of the site would be set back from the road by an open area (entrance green) where no development is proposed. It is also proposed to enhance and strengthen the hedge which adjoins Baddesley Road. This would provide screening along this edge of Baddesley Road. The proposed care home/core building which would be the tallest building within the site (2.5-3 storeys) would be located towards the centre of the site, where, due to the site levels and the provision of a 'central green' it, and the proposed two storey buildings behind it, would not be visible from Baddesley Road. Buildings positioned along the east of the site would also be limited to 2 storeys which would ensure that the wooded backdrop to the site (Trodds Copse) would be visible from Baddesley Road. Again, the proposals include the enhancement and strengthening of the sites vegetative boundaries along with adequate space remaining within the site to provide further planting and soft landscaping.
- 8.54 If developed in accordance with the submitted parameter plan, it is considered that a care village of the scale proposed would retain the rural character of the area from the most sensitive public vantage point along Baddesley Road. From here, a limited part of the development would be visible and the connection with the surrounding landscape, particularly the woodland beyond the site would be retained. Considering the contained nature of the site and considering the retention and enhancement of the vegetative boundaries, it is considered that views across the gap would not materially change as a result of the development, they would remain predominantly rural as described within the Local Gaps Topic Paper. Taking this into account and considering the existing use/structures located on the site, it is considered that the proposals would not further diminish the physical or visual separation of the settlements of Ampfield and Chandlers Ford, either alone or in cumulation with other existing proposed development. It is not considered that the proposed development would compromise the integrity of

the Local Gap. It is also considered that the proposed development would integrate within the current landscape character of the surrounding area. As such, subject to a condition on any permission requiring any detailed scheme to comply with the submitted parameter plan, it is considered that the proposals would comply with policies E2 and E3 of the RLP. This weighs in favour of the proposed development.

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

The detailed design/layout of the proposed buildings is not to be determined at this Outline stage. However, provided a condition is applied to any permission requiring any detailed scheme to be in accordance with the submitted parameter plan, it is considered that a development, of the scale proposed can be accommodated on the site without there being any resultant adverse harm on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As above, the development would be most visible from Baddesley Road where buildings are proposed to be set back from the road and be limited to being two-storey in height. This would be in keeping with the scale of surrounded development, particularly that in Flexford Close. The taller building and buildings to the rear of the site would not be visible from Baddesley Road. There is also considered to be adequate space within the site to provide for sufficient landscaping to enable the development to further integrate within the surrounding area. As a result, it is considered that the proposals would comply with policy E1 of the RLP.

8.56 **Impact on neighbour amenities**

Whilst this is an outline application, the applicant needs to demonstrate that the proposals would not result in any adverse impacts on surrounding residential amenities. The site is located between two residential areas, Flexford Close to the north east and Wheelhouse Park to south west.

8.57 *Impact on Flexford Close*

The houses in Flexford Close are separated from the site by Monks Brook. The application proposes to include an 8 metre river maintenance buffer between the boundary with Flexford Close and any built development. The boundary between the Flexford Close and the site consists of tall conifer/pine/cypress trees. These currently screen the site from the residents of Flexford Close. It is proposed to progressively remove these trees once new planting has been established. The indicative landscape proposals submitted with the application show that a screen along Monks Brook between the site and the dwellings at Flexford Close would be retained however, further details of this would be included with any reserved matters submission.

8.58 The application is supported by section drawings showing a potential relationship between the proposed buildings on the site and the neighbouring properties at Flexford Close, the sections show that the proposed buildings in the indicative layout would be set on higher ground than the neighbouring properties at Flexford Close to the north east of the site. The indicative layout and site parameter plans demonstrate that buildings nearest to the properties at Flexford Close would be 2 storeys in height.

- 8.59 With regards to relationships between the buildings shown on the indicative layout and the neighbouring dwellings in Flexford Close, the submitted details show that whilst the proposed buildings would be set at a higher level, adequate separation can be provided between them and Flexford Close to prevent any adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers. In addition to this separation (which is shown as a minimum of approximately 20 metres between one of the two storey blocks and the side elevation of 55 Flexford Close. Minimum back to back distance is shown as approximately 22 metres from 79 Flexford Close), vegetation along Monks Brook, which separates the site from Flexford Close would be managed and maintained. This would help to screen the proposed development from the occupiers of dwellings in Flexford Close.
- 8.60 The detailed layout and design of the proposed care village would be considered at reserved matters stage, should outline permission be granted. From the indicative details submitted, as a result of the separation distances shown and subject to the retention of screening along Monks Brook and the restriction on the storey heights of buildings in accordance with the submitted parameters plan, it is considered that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that a layout could be designed within the site that would safeguard the amenities of the dwellings at Flexford Close.
- 8.61 Impact on Wheelhouse Park  
Wheelhouse Park consists of single storey park homes to the south west of the site. The indicative layout shows that the 2.5 – 3 storey core building would be located adjacent to the boundary of the site and Wheelhouse Park. The applicant has submitted section drawings which show that this building would have an approximate separation of 24 metres (building to building) between it and number 17 Wheelhouse Park. A proposed two storey building located further to the south east would be located approximately 20 metres from 11 Wheelhouse Park. Taking this separation into account and considering that the mobile homes at Wheelers Park are set at a higher level from the site and are separated from it by the Wheelhouse Park access road and intervening vegetation, it is considered that the proposals shown on the indicative layout would not result in any adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers on Wheelhouse Park. It is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that a final layout could be designed within the site that would safeguard the amenities of the dwellings at Wheelhouse Park.
- 8.62 General amenity concerns  
The Council's environmental protection officer has commented on several matters that have the potential to impact on neighbour amenity (these are summarised at paragraph 5.9 of this report). Such matters would be dealt with at reserved matters stage when a finalised layout is submitted. Conditions restricting construction times and deliveries will be added to any outline permission to prevent adverse noise impacts on surrounding residential dwellings.

8.63 Amenity – Summary

The applicant has demonstrated that a layout could be designed within the site that would safeguard the amenities of surrounding residential dwellings. The application is therefore considered to comply with policy LHW4 in this regard and this weighs in favour of the development.

8.64 **Ecology**

The site is located in a sensitive location in relation to ecology. It is adjacent to nationally and locally protected sites, these being Trodds Copse Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) to the north west and is close to the New Forest SSSI, River Itchen SSSI and Flexford Nature Reserve Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). In addition, the site is in close proximity to European designated sites (commonly referred to as Natura 2000 sites), these being the New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Emer Bog SAC.

8.65 Nationally and locally protected sites

The application is accompanied by a thorough Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA – EPR, February 2018). This assessment includes measures proposed to avoid or mitigate likely significant ecological impacts to surrounding nationally and local protected sites and provides enhancements in line with national and local planning policy.

8.66 In summary, the EclA concludes that:

*“...with appropriate mitigation, the proposed development will not have any significant negative residual ecological impacts, and will therefore comply with applicable biodiversity related legislation and policy. Positive impacts are also identified, including the discontinuation of unsympathetic practices arising from current land use, and the proposed adoption of sensitive, conservation-led management within land adjacent to Trodds Copse SSSI.”*

8.67 The EclA includes detailed information on the potential impact the development would have on identified receptors both in the construction phase and in the operational phase. The EclA details mitigation that would need to be implemented to ensure that the proposals would not have a likely significant effect on surrounding designated sites. Proposed mitigation includes:

- Impact avoidance by design – concentrating development within areas of relatively low ecological sensitivity, such as previously developed land; the retention and buffering of valuable ecological features such as the woodland edge and stream corridor; and the promotion of habitat connectivity through the provision of a continuous ecological corridor along the site’s eastern, northern and north-western edges.
- Implementation of Construction Method Statement (CMS) or Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).
- Provision of a 15m semi-natural woodland buffer.
- Installation of temporary fencing

- 8.68 In relation to national and locally designated sites (Trodds Copse SSSI and Upper Flexford Nature reserve) The Council's ecologist has been consulted on the proposals and has confirmed that the information submitted in relation to ecological impacts represents the conditions at the site and the ecological impacts potentially arising from the development proposal. He confirms that measures set out in the EclA address the identified impacts and are appropriate and he supports their implementation. Subject to conditions requiring the applicant to submit a detailed Construction Method Statement/Construction Environment Management Plan which includes measures to avoid impacts to ecological receptors, it is not considered that the proposals would result in a likely significant effect on these sites.
- 8.69 *European designated sites and the Habitats Regulations Assessment*  
The Local Planning Authority, as a competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations should have regard for any potential impacts the proposed development would have on the European designated sites of the New Forest SPA, River Itchen SPA and Emer Bog SPA. To assist the LPA in their assessment, the applicant has submitted an 'Information for Habitats Regulations Assessment, Technical Note 09/02/18' which details the potential of the proposed development to affect these European designated sites. The aim of this document is to enable the LPA to fulfil their responsibility under the Habitats Regulations in respect of the need to undertake an Appropriate Assessment.
- 8.70 The technical note assesses the potential recreational impacts on the New Forest and Emer Bog SPA and concludes on both sites that the proposed development is not likely to have significant effects in this regard, on either site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. The information states:  
*"in view of the intended occupancy of the Proposed Development – which will be permanently restricted by S106 obligation to those dependent on care...and of the physical distance between the SPA and the site, which is contiguous to the far boundary of the indicative impact zone identified by TVBC, the proposed provision of new extra care accommodation units is not considered likely to have a significant effect on the SPA, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects."*
- 8.71 With regards to the New Forest SPA specifically, the application site lies within the 13.6km catchment within which research has indicated that there is a risk of increased visitor numbers and recreational pressure as a result of additional residential development within the catchment area. The SPA supports a range of bird species which are vulnerable to impacts from increased recreational use of the site. It has been demonstrated by research supported by Natural England that any net increase in dwelling numbers would contribute to an in-combination likely significant effect on the SPA.



- 8.72 In order to address this impact, mitigation measures are required. The Council has adopted the ‘New Forest SPA Mitigation – Interim Framework’ which proposes a number of mitigation options where it is considered that proposed development would result in a likely significant effect on the interest features of the SPA. These include the provision of a site specific mitigation strategy, the provision of an area of alternative natural green space for recreational use or a financial contribution per dwelling towards off-site mitigation measures.
- 8.73 Taking the submitted technical note into account, Natural England have advised that the proposal is not necessary for the management of the European site and have confirmed that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on any European site (case officer emphasis). Subject to the occupancy of the care village being restricted to those dependent on care, it is not considered that mitigation in line with the Council’s ‘New Forest SPA Mitigation – Interim Framework’ is required in this instance.
- 8.74 With regards to the River Itchen SAC, assessment of potential impacts on this site is included within the submitted EclA. The EclA states that after mitigation, specifically the provision of a CEMP to protect the SPA from impacts, the proposals would not be likely to have a significant residual impact.
- 8.75 In assessing the impact on the River Itchen SAC, Natural England, after considering the information submitted by the applicant have advised that the proposals are unlikely to have a significant effect on this European site.
- 8.76 European sites – summary  
As a result of the above, in accordance with advice from Natural England, who have confirmed that they have no objections to the proposals, it is considered that, subject to conditions (submission of a CEMP) the proposed development would not be likely to have a significant effect on nearby European designated sites. The proposals can therefore be screened out from any requirement for further assessment under the Habitats Regulations. An Appropriate Assessment is not required in this instance.
- 8.77 Protected species  
The EclA notes that the site was found to support a range of species, including a small population of slow worm and grass snake. Parts of the site are also well-used by foraging bats and a range of breeding birds were found to be using the site, although in low numbers. No hazel dormice were found on the site.
- 8.78 With regards to bats, the bat assemblage at the site is considered typical of the habitats found at the site, no significant numbers of rare species were identified. It is recognised that any proposed external lighting at the site could affect bat foraging behaviour. The EclA identifies that a detailed lighting strategy will incorporate the need to retain dark corridors, particularly the eastern stream corridor and the SSSI boundary. The maintenance of the stream corridor, together with any biodiversity enhancements along this

boundary would ensure the maintenance of ecological linkages between Upper Flexford SINC and Trodds Copse SSSI. It is considered necessary to add a condition to any permission requiring a detailed lighting plan to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to the installation of any lighting to ensure that impacts to foraging bats are avoided.

8.79 With regards to reptiles, it is proposed to address impacts to reptiles by translocating them to a receptor area within the site, within the proposed 15m buffer along the boundary with the SSSI. The Council's ecologist notes that the translocation site is not currently suitable but is proposed to be the subject of enhancement measures (see below). The Council's ecologist considers this appropriate however the enhancement will need to be programmed. He therefore advises that the CMS/CEMP, when submitted, clearly sets out timescales for this, as well as any other time-dependent establishment measures for mitigation.

8.80 The EclA proposes mitigation measures for habitats and species on the site. The Council's ecologist considers these measures are acceptable, however has suggested that further, more detail measures would be required in the proposed CMS/CEMP once detailed designs for the scheme are being drawn up (recognising that at present, this is an Outline application and any site layouts are illustrative only). Subject to a condition requiring a CMS/CEMP, it is not considered that the proposals would have a likely significant impact on protected species.

8.81 Enhancements

The EclA proposes the following enhancements to the site as part of the development proposals:

- New pond will be created providing habitat opportunities for a variety of species, and a foraging resource for bats and grass snakes.
- Riparian ground flora within the stream corridor will be enhanced through the removal of existing rubble piles, the clearance of invasive scrub and the selective removal of densely overshading non-native conifers. Areas of cleared building waste will be seeded with a locally appropriate shade-tolerant wildflower species mixture – these measures will enhance both the quality of riparian habitat within the site itself, and the effectiveness of the stream corridor as a green link between Trodds Copse to the north and Upper Flexford Nature Reserve to the south.
- Ten bat boxes and ten bird boxes, of varying design will be installed.
- Stag beetle loggery will be created.

The above biodiversity enhancements are considered to be a benefit of the proposed development.



8.82 Ecology – Summary

It is considered that the information submitted by the applicant satisfactorily demonstrates that, subject to conditions the proposals would not result in a likely significant effect on European, national or locally designated sites. The information submitted also demonstrates that the proposals, subject to conditions, would not be likely to have an adverse impact on protected species and would provide biodiversity enhancements to the site. As a result, it is considered that the proposals would comply with policy E5 of the RLP. This weighs in favour of the proposed development.

8.83 **Highways**

Access

The proposed outline application seeks detailed permission for the access to the site.

8.84 Vehicular access to the site is proposed via the existing priority T-junction access off Baddesley Road. This access currently serves the existing site as well as Wheelhouse Park and North Hill Cottage. The proposal seeks to upgrade this access to provide suitable, all-purpose access including continuous footways into the site by introducing a simple bellmouth. The applicant undertook speed surveys to inform them on the works needed to upgrade the existing access.

8.85 Hampshire County Council highways have agreed the access in principle subject to the completion of a Section 278 agreement. It is considered appropriate to add a Grampian style condition to any outline permission requiring the access to be upgraded prior to any development commencing on the site.

8.86 Traffic generation

The transport statement (TS) submitted in support of the application estimates that the proposed development would result in an increase in trips over and above the existing use of the site. The TS estimates that there would be 5 additional trip in the AM peak (0800-0900) and 30 additional trips in the PM peak (1700-1800). Daily (including peak periods), the TS estimates that there would be 258 additional trips (all figures are net).

8.87 Based on the above figures and in relation to the impact the proposed increase in trips would have on the highway network, the TS concludes that:

*“the number of additional vehicle trips predicted to be generated by the development is considered negligible, and will have minimal discernible impact on the operation of the local highway network”.*

8.88 The highways officer at Hampshire County Council agrees with the findings of the report, confirming that given the trip generation, it is not anticipated the development will result in a severe impact on the highway network in either capacity or safety terms.

8.89 As a result of the above, the proposals are considered to comply with policy T1 of the RLP and this weighs in favour of the proposed development.

8.90 Parking

The TS provides information on the amounts of car and cycle parking that would be provided as part of the proposals and this is shown on the indicative layout. The proposed parking complies with the parking standards set out in Annex G to the RLP. The applicant has therefore demonstrated that the proposals can accommodate the required amount of parking in compliance with policy T2 of the RLP. This weighs in favour of the proposed development. A condition will be added to any permission requiring the retention of parking in perpetuity to prevent potential risks to highway safety in the future

8.91 Travel Plan

The application is accompanied by a Framework Travel Plan (FTP, Cole Eason Consultants Ltd). The FTP sets out a range of targets and objectives to be included in the full travel plan to reduce vehicular impact of the proposed development, and to increase the number of trips made by walking, cycling and public transport. The FTP sets out the following objectives:

1. To establish a management regime for the implementation, co-ordination and review of the Travel Plan.
2. To reduce the total number of single occupancy trips to and from the development site.
3. To encourage the use of public transport to and from the development site.
4. To encourage cycling to and from the development site.
5. To encourage walking to and from the development site.
6. To raise awareness of the Travel Plan.

8.92 The highways officer at Hampshire County Council (HCC) has assessed the FTP on their evaluation criteria for the assessment of travel plans “A guide to development related travel plans.” It is considered that the FTP meets these evaluation criteria and is considered acceptable.

8.93 Given that the Travel Plan is monitored by HCC and fees are required to be paid by HCC, its provision and implementation needs to be secured by way of a S106 legal agreement. A S106 agreement is being progressed by the applicant and an update on this will be provided to the committee in the update paper.

8.94 Highway improvements – proposed additional street lighting on Baddesley Road

The applicant has advised that they have been made aware of local concerns over a lack of street lighting on a stretch of Baddesley Road, between North Millers Dale and the Hursley Road traffic light junction (a distance of approximately 450m). The proposal for a care village in this location, which is within walking distance of existing shops and community facilities in Ashdown Road and Hiltingbury Road would be inhabited by residents that would be able to walk (or use mobility scooters) to access such local facilities. The

applicant has offered a financial contribution to enable additional street lighting to be provided along the current, unlit stretch of road. This would aid the ability of residents of the care village to safely access shops and local facilities throughout the year and particularly during the winter months. The applicant is proposing to secure the contribution within the Section 106 Legal Agreement.

8.95 In accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL), planning obligations (legal agreement) should meet 3 statutory tests, these being:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

In this instance, with regards with points (a) and (b), as above, the site is in walking distance of local facilities, however, part of the route is unlit. It is reasonable to expect that some of the occupiers of the proposed care home would walk/use a mobility scooter to gain access to and benefit from these facilities, particularly those who are unable to drive. However, as some of the route is unlit, and as occupiers of the proposed care village would be vulnerable members of the community, they may be dissuaded from accessing the facilities using this route. Policy T1 of the RLP requires developments to be accessible for all users and states that proposed users should not be discouraged to use the surrounding highway network (including footpaths). This policy also requires developments to promote the use of sustainable transport. Providing lighting along the remaining stretch of Baddesley Road would make the nearby facilities more accessible, particularly during the darker, winter months, for the occupiers of the proposed care home and would encourage more sustainable modes of transport. As a result, the proposed contribution from the applicant is considered to be necessary in order for the application to comply with policy T1 of the RLP and therefore complies with point (a) above. The proposed contribution would also be directly related to the proposed development on the site and as such, complies with point (b) above. With regards to point (c), the applicant is proposing a contribution which relates to providing lighting to a part of the highway that is not currently lit only, to provide a safe route to local facilities for occupiers of the proposed development. As such, it is considered that the contribution would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. As a result of the above, it is considered that the applicant's offer of a contribution towards additional street lighting and for this to be sought by a legal agreement would accord with the CIL regulations. It is therefore appropriate to require this contribution by way of a legal agreement linked to this application.

8.96 Highways – Summary

Subject to conditions securing the amended access and requiring the retention of parking in perpetuity along with the provision of a S106 agreement securing the Travel Plan and additional street lighting along Baddesley Road, it is considered that the proposals would not have any adverse impacts on the highway network or highway safety in accordance with policies T1 and T2 of the RLP.

8.97 **Flooding and drainage**

The application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA – Cole Easdon Consultants Ltd, February 2018) and Flood Zone Sequential & Exception Test Report (Pegasus Group, February 2018). The FRA incorporates strategies for surface water and foul water drainage.

8.98 Surface water drainage strategy

The FRA confirms that at present, the site does not include any formal drainage system and that existing runoff from the site area drains to Monk's Brook as overland flow/greenfield runoff. The application proposes on-site storage of surface water taking into account predicted future effects of climate change. Storage would be provided within Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in the form of cellular attenuation tanks located throughout the site within parking areas, driveways and landscaping. Plans have been submitted which show that there are suitable SUDS locations throughout the site and that in principle the necessary attenuation volume can be readily accommodated within the proposed development. The precise location of the SUDS systems will be determined at detail design/reserved matters stage. The SUDS is proposed to discharge independently into Monks Brook flows to which will be restricted hydrobrake flow controls.

8.99 The FRA confirms that all surface water drainage infrastructure will be maintained privately as part of the overall management of the site.

8.100 Foul water drainage strategy

It is proposed that foul flows from the development will be discharged to the existing public foul sewer to the south of the site. The applicant states that the existing foul sewer system does not currently have the capacity for the additional flows generated by the proposed development and that foul sewer improvements would be required. Such improvements would be undertaken separately from the planning process through a Section 98 sewer requisition application. It is understood that the applicant is in discussions with Southern Water with regards to this.

8.101 Southern Water has commented on the proposals and has confirmed that the existing sewer infrastructure does not have the capacity to accommodate the needs of the proposed development and that additional local infrastructure will need to be provided. As above, the provision of such infrastructure is a separate matter between the developer and Southern Water. Southern Water have recommended a condition be added to any approval requiring the developer to submit detailed foul drainage information before any development on the site is commenced.

8.102 Drainage – Summary

HCC as Lead Local Flood Authority have reviewed the information submitted by the applicant and have confirmed that the general principles for the surface water drainage proposals are acceptable, however, they have requested that further information be submitted as part of a more detailed design phase.

8.103 Flooding

The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such is considered to be at the least risk of flooding. Part of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 which are at higher risk of flooding. In terms of historical flooding, the Test Valley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) does not contain any records of flooding at the site, in addition, the Environment Agency do not hold any records of flooding at the site.

8.104 The applicant has confirmed that all development proposed within the site would be located within Flood Zone 1. Notwithstanding this, as part of the site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and as the proposed use of the site would be considered a 'more vulnerable' use (table 3 in the NPPF technical guidance), a sequential test and exception test are required.

8.105 The NPPF seeks to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding by directing development away from those areas at highest risk. Where development is considered necessary in areas of high flood risk, it should be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The NPPF applies a sequential approach to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding and states that '*Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding.*' In order to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites at a lower risk of flooding elsewhere, a Sequential Test needs to be undertaken. If the proposals meet the Sequential Test, the proposals would then need to satisfy the Exception Test. In order for the Exception Test to be passed:

- It must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, informed by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment where one has been prepared; and
- A site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.

The applicant's compliance with the Sequential and Exception Tests are outlined in the following paragraphs.

8.106 Sequential test

The application is supported by a Flood Zone Sequential & Exception Test Report (Pegasus Group, February 2018). This details available sites for the proposed development within a search area agreed by the Local Planning Authority (in accordance with guidance within the NPPF and NPPG). The agreed search area is based on the Assessment by Carterwood (need assessment) which accompanies the application. This is the catchment area which forms the justification for the proposed care home in terms of unmet need.

- 8.107 The applicant has reviewed the agreed search area in order to determine whether there are alternative sites suitable for the proposed development which would be sequentially preferable in terms of flooding (i.e. located in Flood Zone 1). A total of 21 sites crossing 4 authority boundaries and consisting of allocated sites, sites with existing/extant permission and windfall sites were identified within the search area, however, these were all discounted for various reasons, including:
- Care provision not mentioned in allocation policy
  - Site not available for development
  - Site is greenfield
  - Site would not provide similar benefits to the proposals
  - Site has limited capacity as existing residences and uses need to be retained on the site.
  - Site not suitable for the type of development proposed
  - Site is not located in a sequentially preferable location in relation to flooding

No other sites were identified within the search area that would be available and suitable for the proposed use.

- 8.108 Following assessment of potential sites within the agreed search area, it is considered that the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated that it is not possible to locate the proposed development in a flood zone with a lower probability of flooding. However, in order for the proposal to be acceptable in relation to flooding, the Exception Test needs to be passed.

8.109 Exception test

*Development must provide wider sustainability benefits to the community*

It is considered that the proposals would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that would outweigh the flood risk identified. As outlined in this report, the proposals would result in benefits to the local economy and would provide social benefits by providing housing for older people where there is an identified need. The proposals would also replace the unrestricted industrial use of the site and would provide a number of ecological enhancements. As such, the proposals would also result in environmental benefits. The above benefits are considered to outweigh the risk of flooding at the site. The proposals are considered to pass the first part of the Exception Test.

8.110 *Demonstration that the development would be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere*

- A site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.



A site specific flood risk assessment (FRA) has been submitted in support of the application proposals. This document considers the extreme ‘upper end’ climate change and confirms that none of the built development would be located within the floodplain. In addition, the FRA confirms:

- Minimum floor levels are proposed which have taken into account the ‘Upper End’ climate change allowance.
- Implementation of suitable SUDs systems (as outlined in the above paragraphs)

As a result of the above, it is considered that the proposals would be safe for the proposed users over the lifetime of the development.

8.111 As a result of the above, it is considered that the proposals pass the second part of the Exception Test. The Environment Agency have also confirmed no objection to the proposals.

8.112 Flooding summary

As a result of the above, it is considered that sufficient information has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that both the Sequential and Exception Tests can be passed. It is also considered that the above information, submitted in support of the application demonstrates that the proposals are appropriately flood resilient and resistant in accordance with paragraph 103 of the NPPF. As such, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable in terms of flooding and comply with the guidance set out in the NPPF, NPPG and complies with policy E7 of the RLP. The Environment Agency has been consulted on the application and has confirmed no objections. This weighs in favour of the proposed development.

8.113 **Ground contamination**

Due to the current and previous uses at the site, there is potential for some contamination to be present. The application is supported by a Phase 1 Site Investigation report (ERS, June 2016) which provides initial evidence on potential ground contamination at the site.

8.114 The Phase 1 report undertook a conceptual site model (CSM) to permit a preliminary risk assessment. The CSM shows potential for the presence of contaminants in the eastern zone of the site due to the previous use as a brickworks, sawmill, timber yard. Historical uses also include vehicle storage, breaking and maintenance (several fuel tanks were identified), asbestos containing materials and substation. The Phase 1 report noted that potentially elevated concentrations of contaminants may pose a risk to a number of receptors, including humans and controlled waters. The report noted that the central and western areas of the site appear to have remained undeveloped, or developed as a caravan park. No previous contaminative uses were identified.



- 8.115 The report recommends that further site investigations are required in accordance with the site investigation strategy included within the document. In order to secure further investigation of the site and appropriate remediation which would bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use, it is considered appropriate to add a condition to any permission requiring such information before any development commences. Subject to such a condition, it is considered that the proposals would comply with policy E8 of the RLP. This weighs in favour of the proposals.
- 8.116 **Archaeology**  
The application is supported by an archaeological desk-based assessment (Pegasus Group, June 2017). This concludes that the developed area of the site has been subject to extensive past disturbance which may have truncated or removed below-ground archaeological remains. It is considered that archaeological potential at the site was limited and has been extensively compromised. On this basis, it is not considered that proposed development would have any adverse impacts on underground archaeology. The proposals would accord with policy E9 in this regard and this weighs in favour of the development.
- 8.117 **The Planning Balance**  
The site is situated in a countryside location as defined by the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 (RLP). Evidence provided, and which is considered reasonable, supports the contention that the proposed care village requires a countryside location in accordance with policy COM2(b) of the RLP. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is reiterated in paragraph 2, amongst others, of the NPPF, which is itself a material consideration.
- 8.118 In this instance, it is considered that there are other material considerations which together, provide further justification in accordance with policy COM2(b). These are summarised below:
- Housing Need – the proposed development would provide housing for a group which have a particular housing need, in this case, for older people for which the applicant has demonstrated that there is a need (both within Test Valley and within a market catchment area). The proposals would help to meet this need and would contribute to the provision of a mix of housing sizes and types to meet the demographic changes of the Borough. This is in accordance with policy COM1 of the RLP and advice contained within the NPPF.
  - Previously Developed Land - Much of the site is considered to be previously developed land as defined by the NPPF. The re-development of such sites are encouraged by both local and national planning policies in preference to development on greenfield sites.
  - Amenity – The proposed re-development of the site would result in the replacement of unrestricted lawful industrial uses on the site which have the potential to cause significant harm to the character or the area and the amenities of the surrounding area, including harm to surrounding residential amenities.

- Benefits to the economy – The proposed development would result in significant benefits to the local economy through both the construction and operational phases.
- Ecology - The proposed development would provide ecological enhancements to the site, which would not otherwise be provided if the existing uses at the site were to remain.

8.119 In addition to the above, further benefits of the proposals include:

- Drainage – Provision of formal drainage on the site
- Contamination – The site is potentially contaminated due to its current and previous uses. Conditions on any permission would ensure that there is appropriate remediation of any contamination at the site.
- Streetlighting – Application would secure a contribution towards the provision of additional streetlighting along Baddesley Road.
- Social benefits - The proposals would provide social benefits as outlined at paragraph 8.30 above.

8.120 It is also considered that the indicative layout submitted with the application satisfactorily demonstrates that the amount and scale of development could be implemented on the site without further diminishing the physical and visual separation of the Local Gap or compromising the integrity of the Local Gap and would satisfactorily integrate with both the landscape character of the surrounding area and the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposals, subject to conditions and a legal agreement would not result in any adverse impacts on residential amenity, ecology, highways, flooding or drainage and would be in accordance with the relevant policies contained within the RLP which relate to these considerations.

8.121 As a result of compliance with policy COM2(b) and the other relevant policies contained within the RLP and considering the benefits arising from the proposed development, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable and as such, permission is recommended.

8.122 **Other matters**

Previously developed land

One of the third party representations refers to the site not being on the Council's Brownfield Register. Although the site is not on the Brownfield Register, this does not prevent it from meeting the definition of previously developed land as provided in the NPPF.

8.123 Site ownership

One of the third party representations refers to the ownership of the site and that this presents a conflict of interests. The application is to be determined by the Southern Area Planning Committee in accordance with the Member and Officer Interests Protocol as a result of Member interests in the site. It should also be noted that the ownership of the site is not a material planning consideration and as such is not something that would be considered as part of the determination process.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle under policy COM2(b) of the RLP. It is also considered that the amount and scale of development could be implemented on the site without further diminishing the physical and visual separation of the Local Gap or compromising the integrity of the Local Gap and would satisfactorily integrate with both the landscape character of the surrounding area and the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposals, subject to conditions and a legal agreement would not result in any adverse impacts on residential amenity, ecology, highways, flooding or drainage and would be in accordance with the relevant policies contained within the RLP which relate to these considerations. As a result, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable and as such, permission is recommended.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building subject to the completion of a legal agreement securing the following:**

- **Restriction of occupation of the units of accommodation including the setting out of a Basic Care Package;**
- **Restriction on occupation to ensure that communal facilities are provided;**
- **Undergrounding of existing overhead electricity lines;**
- **Requirement to submit and implement a full Travel Plan, payment of the Travel Plan approval and monitoring fees and provision of a surety mechanism to ensure implementation of the Travel Plan; and**
- **Secure financial contribution towards additional street lighting along Baddesley Road;**

**then PERMISSION subject to:**

1. **Applications for the approval of all the reserved matters referred to herein shall be made within a period of three years from the date of this permission. The development to which the permission relates shall be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:**
  - i) **five years from the date of this permission: or**
  - ii) **two years from the final approval of the said reserved matters, or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.****Reason: To comply with the provision of S.92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.**
2. **Approval of the details of the layout, and appearance of the building(s), and the landscaping of the site (herein after called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before the development is commenced.****Reason: To comply with Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Management Procedure) (England) Development Procedure) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order).**

- 3. The development hereby permitted shall be used only as a care village comprising a care home/community hub building including core facilities, extra care units and ancillary uses. The barn/store hereby permitted shall only be used as a store/office for the mobile home park known as Wheelhouse Park and for no other purposes, including any purpose in Classes C2, B8 or B1; of the Schedule of to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2015, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.**

**Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can exercise control in the locality in the interest of the local amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy COM2.**
- 4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the Parameters Plan Ref. BRS.2581\_38 Rev B.**

**Reason: To ensure that proposed buildings are appropriately located within the site to prevent adverse impacts on the Local Gap, surrounding landscape character and on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policies E1, E2 and E3.**
- 5. Prior to the commencement of development the means of access to the site detailed on plan number 5303/204 shall be fully implemented and retained as such at all times.**

**Reason: To ensure that the access into the site is provided to an appropriate standard to serve the development in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.**
- 6. A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the commencement of development. The Construction Traffic Management Plan 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 approved details shall be fully implemented before development is commenced.**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 7. The landscaping of the site should be undertaken broadly in accordance with the details set out within the Landscape Strategy Plan (Illustrative) drawing number BRS.2581\_28 Sheet 1/2 Rev D and BRS.2581\_28 Sheet 2/3 Rev D.**

**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.**
- 8. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures set out in the Ampfield Care Village Ecological Impact Assessment, February 2018 (P16/10-2E).**

**Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

- 9. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed Construction Environment Management Plan that includes measures to avoid impacts to Trodds Copse SSSI, measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for impacts to protected species and habitat losses, and biodiversity enhancements to be implemented across the site with particular reference to the northern and eastern boundaries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with the approved details, with all enhancement features being permanently retained.**

**Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

- 10. Prior to the commencement of development a detailed external lighting plan showing that the northern and eastern site boundaries and associated habitats associated with the stream corridor and Trodds Copse SSSI will remain unilluminated shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To avoid impacts to foraging bats, in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

- 11. All those involved with the development should be informed of the status and legal obligations attached to the Trodds Copse SSSI designation and where the boundary of the protected area is.**

**Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

- 12. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (Issue 6, CEC, February 2018).**

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

- 13. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority, construction and demolition activities including the delivery or removal of materials to or from the site, shall only take place between the hours of 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08:00 hours and 13:00 hours on Saturday (excluding Bank Holidays). No such activity shall occur on Sundays or Bank Holidays.**

**Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**



- 14. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the planning authority, deliveries and unloading activities servicing the care home/community hub building including core facilities shall only occur between the hours of 08:00 hours and 18:00 hours Monday to Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 15. Before the commencement of development of the Community Hub building, a detailed design and layout of the building shall be submitted together with a scheme for mitigating the noise impact from the use of this building for approval in writing by the local planning authority. Before the first use of the Community Hub building the approved design, layout and noise mitigation scheme shall be implemented and unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, maintained thereafter.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 16. Prior to the installation of any fixed plant or equipment a scheme for mitigating the noise impact from any fixed plant or equipment shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the first use of such equipment unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, maintained thereafter.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 17. Prior to the installation of any cooking extraction equipment, a scheme for mitigating the odour impact from any cooking extraction plant or equipment shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the first use of such equipment unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and maintained thereafter.  
Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
- 18. No development shall commence (other than any approved demolition and site clearance works) until an assessment of the nature and extent of any contamination and a scheme for remediating the contamination has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The assessment must be undertaken by a competent person, and shall assess the presence of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The assessment shall comprise of an intrusive site investigation as recommended by ERS and detailed in Section 11 of their Phase 1 Site Investigation report dated 16th June 2016, and in the event that contamination is found, or is considered likely, a scheme containing remediation**



**proposals designed to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use. Such remediation proposals shall include clear remediation objectives and criteria, an appraisal of the remediation options, and the arrangements for the supervision of remediation works by a competent person. The site shall not be brought in to use until a verification report, for the purpose of certifying adherence to the approved remediation scheme, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason: To ensure a safe living/working environment in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E8.**

- 19. In the event that contamination (that was not previously identified) is found at any time during construction works, the presence of such contamination shall be reported in writing to the Local Planning Authority without delay and development shall be suspended on the affected part of the site until a remediation scheme for dealing with that contamination has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved remediation scheme shall be implemented and, if requested, a verification report, for the purpose of certifying adherence to the approved remediation scheme, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the site being brought in to use.**


**Reason: To ensure a safe living/working environment in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E8.**

- 20. Prior to the commencement of development details of the proposed means of foul and surface water drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In relation to foul drainage, such information should include a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul disposal and a implementation timetable. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To ensure that the development can be served by appropriate foul and surface water drainage and in the interests of biodiversity in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policies E5, E7 and E8.**

**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.**



**Siteplan**

**Test Valley**  
Borough Council

THIS PLOT IS PRODUCED FROM ORDNANCE SURVEY MATERIAL WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF HER MAJESTY'S STATIONARY OFFICE © CROWN COPYRIGHT UNAUTHORISED REPRODUCTION INFRINGES CROWN COPYRIGHT AND MAY LEAD TO PROSECUTION OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS. TEST VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL LICENCE No. 100024295 2013



















Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Ltd. Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Copyright Licence number 100042093. Promap. Licence number 100020449. Emagis/Lite Licence number 0100031673. Standard OS Licence rights conditions apply. Pegasus accepts no liability for any use of this document other than for its original purpose, or by the original client, or following Pegasus' express agreement to such use. T: 01285 641717 www.pegasuspg.co.uk



**KEY:**

-  APPLICATION BOUNDARY
-  2 STOREY BUILDING HEIGHTS
-  2.5/3 STOREY BUILDING HEIGHTS
-  STORAGE/OFFICE UNIT TO SERVE WHEELHOUSE PARK

-  VEHICULAR ACCESS
-  SITE FALL
-  MINIMUM BACK-TO-BACK SEPARATION DISTANCES
-  MINIMUM SEPARATION DISTANCES TO SIDE GABLE

-  GREEN SPACE
-  LANDSCAPE CORRIDOR
-  ECOLOGY BUFFER
-  RETAINED FEATURE TREES

**CHANDLERS FORD - PARAMETERS PLAN** Pegasus Design









- NOTES**
- 1. Buildings indicated as blocks to illustrate scale and massing impact, and subject to detailed design
  - 2. Tree heights in accordance with Topographical Survey Ref. 1849\_03\_16\_06

**NOTES**


1. Buildings indicated as blocks to illustrate scale and massing impact, and subject to detailed design
2. Tree heights in accordance with Topographical Survey Ref. 1849\_03\_16\_06




**SECTION A-A**



**SECTION B-B**



**KEY PLAN SCALE 1:2500 (1:5000@A3)**



**OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION**

**PERBURY GROUP**  
DEVELOPMENT • LAND • INVESTMENT

Proposed ground level amended 10.04.2018  
Site boundary revised as per Client's instructions dated 28.02.2018

**REVISIONS**

NO.	REVISION	DATE
1	Preliminary	01.08.2018
2	For Approval	
3	Tender	
4	Construction	

**PERBURY (Developments) Ltd**

**Project:** Core Village  
Hamphire SCS2 98H


**DRAWING TITLE:** Indicative Site Sections - Sheet 1

**SCALE:** DRAWN BY: GFG  
1:2500@A1/1:5000@A3 MP 12.01.2018

**DRAWING NO.:** 16-099-103



# Superseded indicative layout



- NOTES**
- 1. The drawings are the property of Condy & Lofthouse Ltd and shall not be reproduced without their written consent.
  - 2. All dimensions are to be checked on site. Do not rely on the drawings as a guide to dimensions on site. Any queries please contact the architect.
- MATERIALS PROHIBITED**
- 1. High pressure concrete in the foot pavement.
  - 2. Wood cladding to permanent structures.
  - 3. Cladding to be made of stone or stone effect tiles, or other materials approved by the Council of the Borough of Havant.
  - 4. Work regulations, as amended 2008, or any other statutory regulations or amendments thereto.
  - 5. Any materials of a nature or type which are not listed in the schedule of materials approved for use in reinforced concrete, which do not comply with BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 6. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 7. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 8. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 9. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 10. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 11. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 12. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 13. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 14. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 15. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 16. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 17. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 18. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 19. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.
  - 20. BS EN 12620:2002 properties of aggregates used in concrete.

- KEY**
- 1. Site Boundary  
4.19Ha / 10.36Acres
  - 2. Land Controlled by Applicant  
Outside Red Line
  - 3. Eco Buffer (min 15m)
  - 4. 8m River Maintenance Zone
  - 5. Climate Change Floodplain  
(As confirmed by Cole Easdon)
  - 6. Climate Change Floodplain - Revised
  - 7. Existing Building
  - 8. Proposed Building

- OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION**
- 1. Site boundary amended as per Client instructions dated 23.06.2017 / 23.06.2017
  - 2. Front of site amended to suit Pegasus Landscape Plan received 21.04.2017
  - 3. Apartment block footprints amended 22.06.2017

**PERBURY GROUP**  
DEVELOPMENT • LAND • INVESTMENT

REVISION DETAILS DATE/BY

- 1. Preliminary
- 2. For Approval
- 3. Tender
- 4. Construction

**PERBURY GROUP**  
Perbury (Developments) Ltd

**PROJECION**  
Amplefield Care Village  
Amplefield  
Hampshire SO52 9BH

**DRAWING TITLE**  
Site Plan - As Proposed (Illustrative)

**SCALE**  
1:1000@A2

**DRAWING NO**  
16-099-105

**REVISION**  
CS 22.02.2017

**DATE**  
22.02.2017

**CONDY & LOFTHOUSE LTD**  
Trading as CLA • Unit 17, Connect Business Village • 24 Derby Road • Liverpool • L5 9PR • E: info@condylofthouse.co.uk • www.condylofthouse.co.uk

**CLA**  
Condy Lofthouse Architects

T: 0151 207 4371 • F: 0151 207 7087

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Officer Update Report to Southern Area Planning Committee on 15 May 2018**

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	17/01615/OUTS
<b>SITE</b>	Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road, Flexford, SO52 9BH, <b>AMPFIELD</b>
<b>COMMITTEE DATE</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2018
<b>ITEM NO.</b>	7
<b>PAGE NO.</b>	11 - 69

---

#### **1.0 VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 A viewing panel was held on Friday 11 May 2018. Members present at the viewing panel were Councillors Anderdon, Bundy, Cooper, Alan Dowden, Celia Dowden, Finlay, Jeffrey and Thom. Apologies were received from Councillors Baverstock, Hibberd, Johnston, Richards and Ward.

#### **2.0 ADDITIONAL PLAN**

2.1 An additional plan showing the proposed access arrangements and referenced in Condition 5, page 59 of the Agenda Report is attached to this update paper.

2.2 The presentation includes some artist's impressions of the proposed development as prepared by the applicant. A plan showing where these artists' impressions are taken from has been attached to this update paper to aid Members understanding of where these viewpoints are within the site.

#### **3.0 PETITION**

3.1 The Case Officer is aware of a petition that was handed to the highways officer in relation to additional lighting along Baddesley Road. The petition is dated 4 December 2016 and is entitled '*We the undersigned want street lights installed on the remainder of Baddesley Road which is unlit*' and has 59 signatories. The petition was forwarded to Hampshire County Council.

3.2 The petition was not submitted as part of this planning application and as such does not form part of the representations considered in the Agenda Report.

#### **4.0 CONSULTATIONS (second round)**

4.1 **Natural England** – No objection subject to conditions.  
Comments as per original response received which is summarised on page 20 of the Agenda Report.

4.2 **Ecology** – Nothing further to add on original comments which are summarised: on page 18 of the Agenda Report. The Council's ecologist has provided advice in relation to the wording of conditions 8 and 9 (see paragraph 5.1 below).

## 5.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### 5.1 Amended/additional conditions

#### *Conditions 8 and 9 – Ecology*

The requirement for biodiversity enhancement is duplicated in both conditions 8 and 9 (page 60 of the Agenda Report). Condition 9, which deals with the construction period has been amended to remove the requirement for enhancement. Condition 8, in consultation with the Council's ecologist has been amended to secure more detailed biodiversity enhancement in the form of a Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy. Such detailed enhancement is not included in the submitted Ecological Assessment report (EPR, February 2018) which only includes the principle of enhancement measures and broad recommendations. Further details are required to ensure the enhancement measures proposed are precise and enforceable.

### 5.2 *Condition 14 – deliveries and unloading*

The applicant, in their discussions with potential operators of the care village, is concerned about the restrictions relating to deliveries and unloading activities servicing the care home/community hub building (including core facilities) included in condition 14 on page 61 of the agenda report. The applicant has advised that whilst the proposed use would not generate significant deliveries (or HGVs) some will arrive earlier than 8am. The applicant has therefore suggested that the condition be amended to reflect the following time restrictions:

- 0700 – 1900 Monday to Saturday
- 0800 – 1200 Sundays

5.3 The case officer has consulted the Council's environmental protection officer in relation to the above who has confirmed that the hours suggested by the applicant are appropriate for this site/development. As a result, condition 14 included on page 61 of the agenda report is to be amended.

### 5.4 *Additional condition – Trees*

The Council's tree officer has advised that a condition should be added to any permission requiring the applicant to submit a scheme for the protection of trees to be retained which is to then be approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such a condition is required to ensure any retained trees are adequately protected during the construction phase of the development. As such, an additional condition (21) as is to be added to the officer recommendation.

### 5.5 Undergrounding of overhead electricity lines

The officer recommendation included on page 58 of the Agenda Report includes the undergrounding of the overhead electricity lines which are proposed to be dealt with through a legal agreement. Since the publication of the Agenda Report, it is considered that this matter can be dealt with by way of a condition rather than being an obligation in the legal agreement. As such, an additional condition (22) is to be added to the officer recommendation to require the undergrounding of the overhead electricity lines.



5.6 Proposed Core Building

It is proposed that the core building would include a community facility where the applicant proposes that older people living locally to the site (those not resident at the care village) will have access to (this facility was shown as a 'club house' on the original indicative layout shown on page 69 of the Agenda Report). As reported at paragraph 3.1 (page 13) of the Agenda Report, such facilities are likely to include a reception area, lounge, kitchens, restaurant/bistro, stores, small shop, managers/staff offices, treatment room, hairdressers salon, fitness room, hydro therapy pool and/or domiciliary care room. The benefits of the use of such facilities for older people who are local to the care village but not resident within it are detailed at paragraphs 8.30 and 8.119 of the Agenda Report. Access by older members of the community living locally to the site (on a membership basis) is to be secured through the legal agreement and this is reflected in the amended recommendation below.

6.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

**Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building subject to the completion of a legal agreement securing the following:**


- **Restriction of occupation of the units of accommodation including the setting out of a Basic Care Package;**
- **Restriction on occupation to ensure that communal facilities are provided;**
- **Requirement to submit and implement a full Travel Plan, payment of the Travel Plan approval and monitoring fees and provision of a surety mechanism to ensure the implementation of the Travel Plan;**
- **Secure financial contribution towards additional street lighting on Baddesley Road; and**
- **Requirement to provide access to the proposed community facilities to older people who reside in the locality of the site;**


**then PERMISSION subject to the conditions and notes as per the agenda report including amended conditions 8, 9 and 14 and additional conditions 21 and 22 which are detailed as follows:**

8. **Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy that includes detailed measures building on the recommendations in Sections 6.3 to 6.6 of the Ampfield Care Village Ecological Impact Assessment report (EPR, February 2018) and includes establishment and planting specifications and techniques, location drawings, long-term management prescriptions, monitoring and review strategy, details of management organisations and funding sources, and commitment to report back to the Local Planning Authority during the fifth year post-completion, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with the approved details with all such enhancement features being managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.**

- Reason: To enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
9. **Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed Construction Environment Management Plan that includes detailed measures to avoid impacts to Trodds Copse SSSI and detailed measures to avoid, mitigate and compensate for impacts to protected species and habitat losses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with the approved details.**
- Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
14. **Deliveries and unloading activities servicing the care home/community hub building including core facilities shall only occur between the hours of 0700 hours and 1900 hours Monday to Saturday, between 0800 hours and 1200 hours on Sundays and Bank Holidays.**
- Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.**
21. **No development shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a scheme for the protection of trees to be retained has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include a plan showing the location and specification of tree protective barriers. Such barriers shall be erected prior to any other site operations and at least three working days' notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority that it has been erected.**
- Note: The protective barriers shall be as specified at Chapter 6.2 and detailed in figure 2 of B.S.5837:2012 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**
- 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 (2016).**
22. **No development shall take place on the site until a scheme for undergrounding existing electricity line(s) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to the occupation of any residential unit on the site the electricity lines shall be placed underground in accordance with the approved scheme.**
- Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interests of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policies E1 and E2.**
-





Copyright:  YORK HOUSE  
EDISON PARK  
DORCAN WAY  
SWINDON  
WILTSHIRE  
SN3 3RB  
Tel : 01793 619645

Web Site: [www.ColeEasdon.com](http://www.ColeEasdon.com)  
Email: [cec@ColeEasdon.com](mailto:cec@ColeEasdon.com)

Client: **Perbury (Developments) Ltd**

Drawn By: **Badesley Road,  
Chandler's Ford  
Hampshire**

Drawings Title: **Proposed Access Plan**

FOR COMMENT	FOR PLANNING	FOR TENDER	FOR APPROVAL	FOR CONSTRUCTION	AS BUILT
"CONSTRUCTION AT CLIENT / CONTRACTOR RISK"					
Project No:	PJS	Drawn By:	PJS	Checked By:	JBF
Date:	March 2018	Scale:	1:250 (A1)		
Dwg No:	5303/204	Rev:	-		







## ITEM 8

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	18/01568/FULLS
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	18.06.2018
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr and Mrs Darran Wall
<b>SITE</b>	85 Upton Crescent, Nursling, SO16 8AA, <b>NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Alterations to roof and raising ridge height including Juliet balcony and roof lights; extension to rear to provide extended living accommodation.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	None.
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Mr Jacob Cooke

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason of being more than local public interest.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site is located within the settlement boundary of Nursling and Rownhams adjacent the highway of Upton Crescent which is gently sloping from north west to south east. The detached bungalow features white render and tile with dormer window to the front and rear elevation. The property features an open frontage with off road parking.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1
- Alterations to roof and raising ridge height by 0.6 metres.
  - 3 no. roof lights to western roof slope, 2 no. roof lights to eastern roof slope.
  - Installation of window to ground floor western side elevation.
  - Installation of window to ground floor eastern side elevation.
  - Installation of patio doors and Juliet balcony to rear elevation.
  - Rear extension.
  - The proposed development is identical to the previously refused application, however, the application is now accompanied by a bat survey in order to overcome the previous sole reason for refusal.

### 4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 **18/00785/FULLS** Alterations to roof and raising ridge height including Juliet balcony and rooflights; extension to rear to provide extended living accommodation **REFUSED** 21.05.2018.

4.2 Reason for refusal: *The site is located within 200m of woodland, therefore is likely to support protected species (bats). The application is not supported by a bat survey to indicate the presence of, or possible impact and mitigation strategy. Therefore, the proposal has the potential to result in the loss, deterioration or harm to habitats or species of importance to biodiversity. Furthermore, Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to allow the Council to reasonably carry out an appropriate assessment of the application in line with the procedure set out in Circular 06/2005, as required under Regulation 61 of the Habitats Regulations. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.*

## 5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Ecology:** No concerns – subject to note.

## 6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 25.07.2018

6.1 **Parish Council:** Objection:

- Objections are the same as those submitted on the 18/00785/FULLS application.
- New ridge height will be higher than the original roof.
- Extend from front to back will cause overdevelopment and will be overbearing to the neighbouring properties.
- Addition of Juliet balcony will allow the occupiers a greater view of the gardens next door effecting the privacy of neighbours.
- Extra windows placed along the side of the kitchen would provide a view directly into the next door living room.
- The addition of an upstairs bathroom with increase in roof size will require additional drainage which is not mentioned in the application.
- Is there enough space to allow for scaffolding between the property and boundary fence?
- The chimney is old and leans, is this to be dealt with at the same time as the roof?
- The privacy affecting the adjoining neighbours is important.

6.2 **Neighbour to 85 Upton Crescent:** Objection summarised:

- Privacy – application site is situated on higher ground than our house increasing the effect on our property.
- Juliet window will overlook our property and greatly reduce privacy.
- Proposed kitchen window and additional side windows will overlook our garden as there is no barrier between the houses. Windows look directly into our lounge, back porch and garage.
- Very few windows directly opposite each other.
- Proposed changes will result in significant loss of privacy to our property and dominated by these changes.
- We will be subject to cooking smells transferred into our property by extractor fan use and/or open window.
- Reduction of light entering property due to increase in height.
- Style and size of proposal is not in keeping with the character of Upton Crescent.
- Overdevelopment of area.

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)

Policy COM2 – Settlement Hierarchy

Policy E1 – High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E5 – Biodiversity

Policy LHW4 – Amenity

Policy T2 – Parking Standards

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance
- Impact on biodiversity
- Impact on amenity
- Impact on parking

8.2 **Principle of Development**

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Nursling and Rownhams. Therefore the principle of development is considered to be fulfilled in accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP.

8.3 **Impact on the Character and Appearance**

Within the street scene, neighbouring properties have been extensively developed, while others retain original scale and features. The proposal is considered not to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. The increase in mass of the dwelling would integrate with the street scene as the neighbouring property of 87 Upton Crescent and others north west of the application site feature development similar to the form, size and scale proposed. Therefore, the use of a hipped roof and the installation of roof lights and Juliet balcony would respect the design principles established within the locality thereby complimenting the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy E1 of the TVBRLP.

8.4 **Impact on Biodiversity**

The previous application was refused as it was not accompanied by a bat survey. The current application is supported by a bat survey which has confirmed no evidence of bats; it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact to bats. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

#### 8.5 **Impact on Amenity**

The rear extension is considered not to adversely impact the private rear amenity space whereby this is reduced to an unacceptable level. The installation of roof lights are considered not to contribute to overlooking of neighbouring properties, firstly, roof lights are present within neighbouring properties therefore a degree of mutual overlooking is present. Secondly, the bottom sill level of the roof lights would be 1.7 metres above the internal finished floor level; it is therefore reasonable to conclude that this would not contribute to overlooking.

8.6 The addition of a window to the north west side elevation would have views toward the side elevation of the neighbouring property of 83 Upton Crescent where no windows are present. As such, this addition would not contribute to overlooking.

8.7 To the south east side elevation, the high level window at ground floor level would not contribute to an adverse impact on overlooking to the neighbouring property of 87 Upton Crescent. There is an existing full height window serving this room which allows an outlook to the East. The proposed window will be located 2 metres above the existing ground level. The high level nature of the window would therefore not offer an ability to overlook the neighbouring property, furthermore the existing window already offers a greater level of overlooking than the window proposed.

8.8 The positioning of the proposed fenestration to the rear of the property is similar to the existing. Therefore, it is considered that there would be no significant change whereby overlooking would be affected.

8.9 The proposal is considered not to have an adverse impact to the privacy of occupants or neighbouring properties and would not reduce the levels of daylight, sunlight or overshadow. As such, the proposal is in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

#### 8.10 **Impact to Parking**

The proposal does not increase the total number of bedrooms, as such the parking standard will remain as per the existing on-site arrangement. The proposal is in accordance with Policy T2 of the TVBRLP.

#### 9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposal is considered to fulfil 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. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan: Composite Plan (Drawing ref: PL/01)  
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
- 3. The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the materials specified on the approved plans and application form.  
Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

**Notes to applicant:**

- 1. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to 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. Bats and their roosts receive strict legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All work must stop immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during this development. Should this occur, further advice should be sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist.**
-







Siteplan

Test Valley  
Borough Council 

THIS PLOT IS PRODUCED FROM ORDNANCE SURVEY MATERIAL WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF HER MAJESTY'S STATIONARY OFFICE © CROWN COPYRIGHT UNAUTHORISED REPRODUCTION INFRINGES CROWN COPYRIGHT AND MAY LEAD TO PROSECUTION OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS.  
TEST VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL LICENCE No. 100024295 2013


18/01568/FULLS

Page 89 of 92




# Location Plan 1:1250

© Crown Copyright (2018). All rights reserved  
Licence Number 100046928.



Block Plan 1:500




Existing Front Elevation


Existing Side Elevation

Existing Side Elevation


Existing Rear Elevation



Existing Ground Floor Plan




Existing First Floor Plan



Existing Roof Plan

## Existing Elevations and Plans 1:100




Proposed Front Elevation


Proposed Side Elevation

Proposed Side Elevation


Proposed Rear Elevation



Proposed Ground Floor Plan



Proposed First Floor Plan



Proposed Roof Plan

## Proposed Elevations and Plans 1:100