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## 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 and 25
September 2018
6 Information Notes

7 18/01560/FULLS - 03.07.2018 11-34
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION)
SITE: The Four Horseshoes, Nursling Street, Nursling, SO16
OYA, NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS
CASE OFFICER: Miss Sarah Barter

8 18/01953/FULLS - 24.07.2018 35-58
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION)
SITE: Land Adjacent to Meadow View, Houghton, Stockbridge, SO20 6LT, HOUGHTON
CASE OFFICER: Ms Astrid Lynn

9 18/02170/FULLS - 14.08.2018 59-80
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE)
SITE: Bracken Wood, Jermyns Lane, Ampfield, SO51 0QA, ROMSEY EXTRA
CASE OFFICER: Miss Sarah Barter
10 18/01811/FULLS - 16.07.2018 ..... 81-89
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION)
SITE: 9 Partry Close, Chandlers Ford, SO53 4SS, VALLEYPARKCASE OFFICER: Mr Nathan Glasgow
11 18/02090/FULLS - 07.08.2018 ..... 90-101
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE)SITE: 29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 1NF,WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
CASE OFFICER: Mr Jacob Cooke
12 18/02092/LBWS - 07.08.2018 ..... 102-112
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE)
SITE: 29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 1NF, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
CASE OFFICER: Mr Jacob Cooke
13 18/02173/LBWS - 15.08.2018 ..... 113-123
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: CONSENT)
SITE: Houghton Lodge, Houghton Road, North Houghton, SO20
6LQ, HOUGHTONCASE OFFICER: Mr Nathan Glasgow
14 18/02267/FULLS - 30.08.2018 ..... 124-130
(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION)
SITE: 14 Fairview Close, Romsey, SO51 7LS, ROMSEY TOWN(CUPERNHAM)
CASE OFFICER: Mrs Sacha Coen

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:

[^0]* 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

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/01560/FULLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 03.07.2018 |
| APPLICANT | Mr R Wickens |
| SITE | The Four Horseshoes, Nursling Street, Nursling, |
|  | SO16 OYA, NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS |
| PROPOSAL | Erection of rear extension to public house, bin stores, |
|  | additional parking and the erection of five houses with <br> associated works |
| AMENDMENTS | Noise Impact Assessment - 30.08.2018 |
|  | Ecology report - 06.09.2018 |
| CASE OFFICER | Miss Sarah Barter |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The Four Horseshoes is an established Public House located on Nursling Street. Nursling Street falls within the parish of Nursling and Rownhams and is at the end of a no through road set down from the M27 / M271 junction and roundabout. The Public House has land to the rear where the proposed rear extension would be located. Land to the south and east of the Public House is where the 5 dwellings are proposed. The application site also includes land to the north of the Public House on the opposite side of the road for car parking.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 Erection of rear extension to public house, bin stores, additional parking and the erection of five houses with associated works.

### 4.0 HISTORY

4.1 17/03121/FULLS - Demolition of existing single storey skittle alley/function room and garage and construction of single storey extension - Withdrawn 06.04.2018

Concerns over parking allocation.
4.2 TVS.2953/7 Retention of use of land at rear of car park as beer garden - Four Horse Shoes Public House, Nursling Street, Nursling. Permission subject to conditions-28.09.1987.
4.3 TVS.2953/2 Construction of car park - land opposite The Four Horseshoes, Nursling Street, Nursling. Permission subject to conditions - 19.08.1981.

### 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Highways - No Objection subject to conditions.
5.2 Landscape - No Objection subject to condition.
5.3 Trees - No Objection subject to conditions.
5.4 Ecology - No Objection subject to condition and SPA payment.
5.5 Environmental Protection - No Objection subject to conditions.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 10.08.2018
6.1 Nursling and Rownhams Parish Council - Objection:

The last outline application to erect residential units on the site was refused.
Please see the 2014 Documents in 14/00131/OUTS. There were extensive objections to putting residential units on this site.

There are of course less units in this application. However the parish council object on the following grounds:

- Noise: The new houses will still be very close to the M27 and M271 Motorways. In 2014 the noise was a factor in the refusal and the motorway is now busier than 4 years ago. This is both Indoor noise levels and external noise levels in private gardens.
- Pollution: There will be a lot of dust, dirt and pollution from the proximity of the motorway. The air quality for a residential development on this site may be quite low.
- Residential or Business land: the old policy I have read lists this as business land. Can the officer please find and read the new policy for this area to see if residential use is allowed. If not then the parish would object on this policy ground as well.
- Bats and nesting birds: I note that Ecology has asked (on 2 August 2018) the applicant to provide a revised report. The Parish council would like a copy of this and may comment further.
- Contributions: there does not seem to be any contribution re New Forrest SPA and Solent Water SPA. I did not see in my reading of the application any contribution to public open space.

The Parish would like to see the four horseshoes redeveloped, but not by the build and sale of residential houses on the site as a way of funding the business refurbishment.

Additional Comments / Observations:

- Highways: There are four "HT" comments on the Highways report issued on the 2 August 2018 I would ask the officer to take note of.

Additional comments received 19.09.2018- Objection

- My council wishes to submit an additional consultation, with an Objection to this application.
- The site of the proposed application is within the junction of two Motorways (M27 and M271). This junction is signalised causing traffic to change gear and accelerate away with associated increased engine noise. It is also on a raised section of Junction 3, causing noise at a higher level. Traffic on these M/W's is continuous day and night, being the main route to Southampton with the Docks, and also towards Totton and the south-west. There will be continuous traffic noise, vibration and dust day and night.
- The application indicates that the houses will require specific design to control internal noise to an acceptable level and external acoustic fencing to protect the garden areas.
- Application 14/01743/FULLS was refused by TVBC, and was appealed (APP/C1760/A/14/2225826). The appeal was dismissed on $17^{\text {th }}$ Feb. 2015.
- The following paragraphs of the Inspector's report are pertinent to the Four Horseshoes application, as they both experience traffic noise from the Motorway. Para 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 \& 16.
- Para 13 also refers to noise readings taken by a Council Officer, which greatly exceeds those recorded in the survey. Are there records of noise readings taken by a Council Officer on the Four Horseshoes site?
- The Council requests that you Refuse this application.
6.211 x letters/emails from various addresses (summarised) - Support:
- Longstanding patrons of the 'shoes and agree it is a sympathetic development with regards to the cottages being in keeping with the area.
- Welcome the proposed application to ensure longevity and indeed the existence of our local pub/restaurant.
- In favour of the application for five houses as understand it will help with the financing of the cost of full refurbishment and extension of the pub.
- Don't think the new houses being built would have detrimental effect on the local 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) COM2, E1, E2, E5, E8, E9, LHW4, T1, T2

### 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the surrounding area
- Design
- Amenity
- Trees
- Highway Safety and Parking Provision
- Ecology
- Other Matters


### 8.2 Principle of development

Revised Local Plan (RLP) (2016)
COM2 (Map 41) - the application site lies within the settlement boundary of Nursling and therefore the principle of residential development and the public house extension is acceptable, subject to any such proposal being appropriate in respect of other policies within the Revised Local Plan. These policies are discussed below.

### 8.3 Impact on the surrounding area

The M27 and M271 wrap around the site to the north and west, this vehicle corridor sits higher than the site and is a prominent landscape feature visually and audibly. There is a public right of way situated adjacent the site to the north, under passing the M271 junction.

### 8.4 Development of five dwellings and associated works

There are no views from the footpath as the area where the dwellings would be located is screened by the public house and Bridgers Farm industrial buildings to the west of the site. The dwellings would be accessed through an existing access between the public house and the end of the existing terrace, no 3 Bridgers Cottages. The public views through the access would not be significant. The dwellings proposed would be visible and would not look out of character within the existing context of the site. The acoustic fencing proposed is sited on the western edge of the site adjacent plots 3 and 4 only and therefore the development continues to allow views straight through the site to the field to the rear (it should be noted that this land whilst currently fields is within the settlement boundary of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016).

### 8.5 Extension to existing Public House

The extension to the rear of the public house would be largely screened from the public realm on the road due to the presence of the existing public house building. Any view given would be of a single storey extension which would not appear out of keeping with the surrounding area and public house use.
8.6 It is considered that the developments can be provided without significant impacts on the wider surrounding area in accordance with policies E1 and E2 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

### 8.7 Design

Development of five dwellings and associated works
Proposed is a semi detached pair and three detached properties all set around a central access. The proposed dwellings are all two storey in design with a mixture of hipped, gable and cat slide roofs. The dwellings are simple in appearance with canopied porches, dormer windows and brick detailing over the fenestration. The design of the dwellings is considered to be appropriate in terms of layout, appearance, scale, materials and building styles in accordance with policy E1 which seeks high quality development in the Borough.

### 8.8 Extension to existing Public House

The single storey extension to the rear fulfils its proposed use by providing a large open area with roof lights and sloping roofs. The proposed design ensures that the original public house building is still legible whilst providing the modern extension to the rear for dining. This is in accordance with policy E1 which seeks high quality development in the Borough.

### 8.9 Amenity

3, 2 and 1 Bridgers Cottages
This terrace row fronts Nursling Street and it located to the east of the public house with the access into the housing in between. The rear gardens of these neighbours extend to the south and would be located adjacent a parking space for 2 Bridgers Cottages and plot 1 which forms part of the semi detached pair. Plot 1 has no windows directly facing towards these neighbours ensuring no direct overlooking occurs as a result. Shadow would fall towards this neighbour but given there is approx. 4 m between the side of the proposed dwelling and the boundary with these neighbours at the narrowest point and approx. 7 m at the widest point the majority of the shadow would fall within this space and therefore it is not considered that this would create a significant impact in this respect. The development is also positioned approx. 23m from the rear elevations at these neighbouring properties and as such the development would not create any significant impacts in terms of loss of light.
8.10 Given the proximity of Bridgers Cottages to the entrance into the site and the main site area it is considered reasonable to apply a condition ensuring construction work is only undertaken between Monday and Friday 07:30 hours to 18:00 hours and Saturday 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours except on Bank Holidays when no such work shall occur. No such work shall occur on Sundays.
8.11 Proposed dwellings

Policy LHW4 also seeks to protect future occupier's amenity. Plots 4 and 5 are proposed to be located to the west of the site to the rear of the public house and the side of office buildings. Whilst Nursling Street is at a lower level than the motorway these dwellings rear gardens face the direction of the motorway and plot 5 s garden borders the pubs outside seating area and garden. As such in consultation with the Environmental Protection Officer and in considering the Noise Impact Statement submitted it is considered appropriate to provide acoustic fencing to a height of 3 m around the rear gardens of both plots 4 and 5 to mitigate against the noise which both of these sources provide. In providing this fencing shadow would be cast across the rear gardens of these properties from approx. 12 midday. The shadow through the afternoon on average is lengthy particularly from the west but in considering that this is an average shadow so the impact could be greater or lesser dependent on the time of year and that the shadow only begins to sit across the rear gardens through the later half of the day it is not considered that on balance this results in a reason for not locating this fence here given the noise attenuation benefits this would offer.
8.12 The appeal decision ref: 2225826, TVBC ref: 14/01743/FULLS at Land South of Upton Lane and East of Station Road, Nursling has been referred to in Parish Council comments. This site is located immediately to the north of the M27 and not located adjacent a junction. The proposal included the use of a static caravan for one gypsy family. A noise assessment including mitigation measures were provided with this application. These measures were considered by Environment Protection. They concluded that the measures were insufficient to ameliorate internal noise to an acceptable level (with all windows remaining closed and no further ventilation) and to also bring about an acceptable living environment. The Inspector agreed and also highlighted concern regarding a wholly enclosed amenity area for the caravan with 2.8 m high acoustic fencing and the proximity of the railway line. Paragraph 16 of the appeal decision states that ' $n$ this case it has not been shown that a satisfactory scheme to mitigate the recorded high background noise can be achieved'.
8.13 The Environmental Protection Officer has no objection to this proposal due to the mitigation proposed which is considered to ensure an acceptable living environment in this location which is to the south and east of the junction with the $\mathrm{M} 27 / \mathrm{M} 271$. The appropriate conditions proposed include acoustic fencing around part of the site and also detail on the fenestration and background ventilation to be provided. This differs from the appeal site referred to as the mitigation has been assessed by Environmental Protection and is considered acceptable in this instance.
8.14 The Noise impact assessment advises that alternative layouts are not considered possible by the client, but infers that the ventilation and fenestration will be provided to take into account the noise levels on site. The Environmental Health Officer agrees with these conclusions but this is subject to appropriate conditions ensuring the detail is provided and agreed prior to first occupation. A query was also raised by the Environmental Protection Officer regarding amplified music at the public house and its impacts. The agent has confirmed that background music only is proposed at the pub. It is considered reasonable to apply a note ensuring the occupiers are aware that a license is required for amplified music.
8.15 The Parish Council have queried whether noise readings have been taken by a council officer on the Four Horseshoes site. Furthermore concern has been raised regarding the accuracy of the noise information submitted at the motorway junction. The Environmental Protection Officer has reviewed the noise readings and others taken on application sites in the area in close proximity to the motorway. Allowing for the variations between sites there is no evidence that the data presented with the application might be flawed. The Environmental Health Officer confirms that the characterisation of the noise on the site is acceptable and there are no grounds to ask for the survey to be repeated or any grounds for the council to commission its own survey.
8.16 Subject to appropriate conditions it is considered that the development can be provided without significant impacts on the amenity of both neighbouring properties and the future occupiers of the development.

### 8.17 Highway safety and parking provision

The parking provided for the pub - Commercial: 44 car spaces and a further 15 overflow car spaces are justified in accordance with RLP. The parking provided in accordance with the amount of dwellings and number of bedrooms provided - 10 spaces plus 1 visitor space are provided in accordance with RLP. An amended drawing has been received increasing the width of car spaces as requested by the Highways Officer.
8.18 The visibility splays provided are justified and manoeuvring space is demonstrated to be adequate. Subject to appropriate conditions ensuring this is provided together with the parking areas proposed it is considered that the development can be provided in accordance with relevant policies in the Revised Borough Local Plan.

### 8.19 Ecology

The application is supported by a professional bat survey report (4Woods Ecology, December 2017). The survey work comprises only a visual survey carried out in December. No dusk / dawn survey work has been done. The survey work identified that the existing function room element to be demolished has negligible bat roost suitability. However, a small number of bat droppings were found under below a small gap in the garage loft space, between the end rafter and front gable wall. DNA analysis has confirmed that these are from a common pipistrelle bat. No further dusk / dawn survey work has been carried out; however, the ecologist has concluded that given the characteristics of the roost feature and number of droppings, the roost only supports occasional summer-roosting bats.
8.20 Natural England have recently introduced further guidance and a policy regarding European protected species that allows decisions on licencing (and hence LPA engagement with the Habitats Regulations) to be based on visual survey findings alone where these can give sufficient confidence to determine the impacts and inform the necessary mitigation. The ecologist for this application has presented a case to this effect, and in this particular case I would agree that there is little to be gained from insisting on further survey work.
8.21 It can be concluded that the development would result in the loss of roosts used by individual non-breeding common pipistrelle bats, although it is unlikely that the site is used by either a maternity colony or as a hibernation roost. If avoidance measures are not taken then the work has the potential to kill / injure individual bats. The development will therefore result in a breach of the EU Directive. The application is provided by an appraisal Initial Ecological Appraisal (Ecosupport, Revision September 2018). Methodologies for sensitive vegetation clearance are provided in the report, in order to avoid impacts to protected species. These measures should be secured in any future consent, along with biodiversity enhancements.
8.22 An EPS licence can only be granted if the development proposal is able to meet three tests:

1. the consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))
2. there must be 'no satisfactory alternative' (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and
3. the action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range' (Regulation 53(9)(b)).
8.23 In terms of the first test, the application will improve the living conditions for neighbouring properties given the unsightly present condition of the site and therefore result in social benefits of this nature. In addition, there are no other buildings on the site which could provide alternative accommodation on the nature proposed and consequently, there is no satisfactory alternative to the proposed development as required by the second test.
8.24 In order to assess the development against the third test, sufficient details must be available to show how killing / injury of bats will be avoided and how the loss of the roost/entry point to the roost will be compensated. In this case, a strategy is provided in the submitted report that includes methods to be followed during the development to ensure bats are not disturbed, killed or injured, together with new roosting opportunities to be provided on the building. It is noted that the County Ecologist supports these measures.
8.25 Subsequently, it is considered that the mitigation measures submitted will ensure that the proposed development is unlikely not to be licensed. With the addition of a condition securing the implementation of the submitted mitigation measures, the application is in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.
8.26 Other Matters

The Parish Council refers to application 14/00131/OUTS and the last outline application to erect residential units on the site which was refused. Application 14/00131/OUTS was refused but it relates to land to the south and east of the current application site and was also considered under the previous local plan when this area was still designated as countryside within the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.As discussed above in paragraph 8.2 the application site is now located within a settlement boundary in the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016 and therefore development is acceptable in these locations subject to other relevant policies.

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal is considered acceptable and in accordance with the development plan.

### 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 plans, number:
D-2100
D-2030
D-2020
D-1000
D-2040
D-1020
D-1130
D-1210
D-1230
D-1225
D-1220
D-1250
D-1260
LC/00266 01B
D-1110
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. No development to the dwellinghouses shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces of the dwellinghouses hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.
4. No development to the public house shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces on the public house hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.
5. Prior to the commencement of development the access shall be constructed with the visibility splays of $2 \mathrm{~m} \times 253 \mathrm{~m}$ and maintained as such at all times. Within these visibility splays notwithstanding the provisions of the Town \& Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no obstacles, including walls, fences and vegetation, shall exceed the height of 1 m above the level of the existing carriageway at any time.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Revised Local Plan DPD 2011-2029 Policy T1.
6. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until provision for 2 cycle parking/storage has been made for each dwelling, in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority has been made. The approved scheme shall be maintained for this purpose at all times. Reason: In the interest of providing sufficient safe parking for cyclists and in accordance with the Test Valley Local Plan 2016 policy T 2.
7. At least the first 6 metres of the widened access track measured from the nearside edge of carriageway of the adjacent highway shall be surfaced in a non-migratory material prior to the use of the access commencing and retained as such at all times.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 policy T1.
8. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until space has been laid out and provided for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles to enable them to enter and leave the site in a forward gear in accordance with the approved plan and this space shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 policies T1, and T2.
9. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out within the Sapling Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement reference J1109 dated May 2018.
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.
10. Tree protective measures installed (in accordance with the tree protection condition) shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or until such time as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities, nor material storage, nor placement of site huts or other equipment what-so-ever shall take place within the barrier.
Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
11. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until a schedule of landscape management and maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas and an implementation programme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme.

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by proper maintenance of existing and new landscape features as an improvement of the appearance of the site and to enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.
12. Construction work (including the delivery of materials and removal of waste) shall unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority only take place between Monday and Friday 07:30 hours to 18:00 hours and Saturday 08:00 hours to 13:00 hours except on Bank Holidays when no such work shall occur. No such work shall occur on Sundays.
Reason: To maintain the character and amenities of the surrounding local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E8.
13. Prior to the first occupation of the 5 dwellings, details of the fenestration to be provided to habitable rooms (living rooms; dining rooms and bedrooms) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. Unless otherwise agreed in writing the submitted details shall show that the proposed complete fenestration (including frames) will have the following performance:

- Fenestration to be installed on the western facades of Units 1, 2 and 3 shall have in the case of bedrooms, an acoustic performance of Rw = 33 or higher and in all other habitable rooms an acoustic performance of $\mathrm{Rw}=31$ or higher AND
- Fenestration to be installed on the western facades of Units 4 and 5 shall have in the case of bedrooms, an acoustic performance of $\mathrm{Rw}=35$ or higher and in all other habitable rooms an acoustic performance of $\mathrm{Rw}=33$ or higher.
The approved fenestration shall be installed prior to first occupation and unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, thereafter maintained.
Reason: To ensure the amenity of the occupants of the dwellings in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.

14. Prior to the first occupation of the five dwellings, details of the means of background ventilation to be provided to habitable rooms (living rooms; dining rooms and bedrooms) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. Unless otherwise agreed in writing the submitted details shall show that the proposed passive vents will when open, have the following performance:

- Passive vents to be installed in bedrooms with an external wall on the western façade of Units 1, 2 and 3 shall have an acoustic performance of Dnew $=33+10 \operatorname{logN}$ or higher and in all other habitable rooms of Dnew $=32+10 \operatorname{logN}$ or higher. $\mathbf{N}$ in all cases denotes the total number of such passive vents installed in each particular habitable room.
- Passive vents to be installed in bedrooms with an external wall on the western façade of Units 4 and 5 shall have an acoustic performance of Dnew $=35+10 \log \mathrm{~N}$ or higher and in all other habitable rooms of Dnew $=34+10 \log$ N or higher. N in all cases denotes the total number of such passive vents installed in each particular habitable room.

The approved passive vents shall be installed prior to first occupation and unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, thereafter maintained.
Reason: To ensure the amenity of the occupants of the dwellings in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.
15. Prior to the first occupation of the five dwellings, details of a scheme for preventing summer overheating within each habitable rooms (living rooms; dining rooms and bedrooms) in Units 4 and 5, except where the particular room has openable fenestration provided to the eastern façade, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The approved scheme shall be installed prior to first occupation and unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, thereafter maintained.
Reason: To ensure the amenity of the occupants of the dwellings in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.
16. Prior to the first occupation of the development details of a 3 metre high acoustic barrier with a minimum superficial mass of $10 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m} 2$ to be located on a footprint shown in Figure 5.1 of the submitted Venta Acoustic Report VA2069.180815.NIA2.1 dated 30/8/18 shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The approved acoustic barrier shall be installed prior to the first occupation of Units 4 or 5 and shall thereafter be maintained. Reason: To ensure the amenity of the occupants of the dwellings in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.
17. The area shown as 'New Lawn' in the submitted site plan D 1020 May 2018 shall not be provided with seating for use by clientele of the public house or otherwise be used as a pub garden.
Reason: To ensure the amenity of the occupants of the dwellings in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LHW4.
18. Development shall proceed in accordance with the measures set out in Section 4.4.1 'Bats' of the Four Horseshoes Public House Nursling Street, Nursling Southampton Ecological
Assessment report (4Woods Ecology, December 2017) unless varied by a European Protected Species (EPS) license issued by Natural England. Thereafter, the replacement bat roost features and enhancements shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the favourable conservation status of bats in accordance with Policy E5 of the Local Plan.
Notes to applicant:

1. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. TVBC work with applicants and their agents in a positive and proactive manner offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of issues that may arise in dealing with the application and where possible suggesting solutions.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed strictly in accordance with the submitted plans, specifications and written particulars for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.
3. Separate permission is required under the Highways Act 1980 to amend an access. Please contact the Head of Highways, Hampshire County Council, Jacobs Gutter Lane, Hounsdown, Totton SOUTHAMPTON, SO40 9TQ, Tel. No. 03005551388 or at roads@hants.gov.uk at least 12 weeks prior to the access works commencing.
4. The agent has confirmed in an email dated 23 August 2018 that no amplified music (other than background music) will be played within the public house. If a license is sought to permit regulated entertainment, the Environmental Health department will consider the viability of such a proposal taking account of the likelihood of noise breakout from the completed building.
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House 3 - East Elevation as Proposed
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House 5 - North Elevation as Proposed
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## ITEM 8

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/01953/FULLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 24.07 .2018 |
| APPLICANT | Mr and Mrs L. Ashford |
| SITE | Land Adjacent to Meadow View, Houghton, |
|  | Stockbridge, SO20 6LT, HOUGHTON |
| PROPOSAL | Erection of a detached dwelling |
| AMENDMENTS | Shade and sunlight study; Ecology Survey. |
|  | 02/08/2018. |
|  | Exterior materials: Brick. 24/08/2018. |
|  | Elevations amended 28.08.2018. |
| CASE OFFICER | Ms Astrid Lynn |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason:
"due to the public perception that it is against the security of the copse on which a preservation order (or equivalent) was served".

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application is made in full on a 0.74 acre site located within the settlement of Houghton, within the Conservation Area. The site is south of Houghton Road, between the dwellings known as Mayfield House and Dianthus. Meadow View and South End Cottages are opposite the site, to the north of Houghton Road. Garden and pasture land outside the settlement lies, to the south east of the site. Beyond this is the River Test, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The route of the Clarendon Way, a Public Right of Way, passes the site to the north, along Village Road.
2.2 The site is the subject of a Woodland Tree Preservation Order, and contains trees and bushes. A single range of derelict pigsties and outbuildings are sited within this undergrowth, in the north of the site, with gable end to the road side, and a further small former building is indicated in the central area of the site.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The proposal is to construct a single detached dwelling. Indicative details for a package treatment plant, new access and entrance gates are included in the submission. The proposed dwelling is located in the northern end of the application site, in a main and smaller section connected by a glass link. The proposed dwelling would therefore have a number of roof levels and gables, and two chimneys. The proposed roofing material is handmade clay tiles. Exterior walls would be in hand made brick with a plinth in blue engineering bricks. The glazed link would also be erected on a plinth of blue engineering bricks.
3.2 The ground floor would comprise living rooms across the entire width of the main house. The first floor would comprise four en-suite bedrooms, and a dressing room for the master bedroom.
3.3 Plans depict a vehicular access opposite Meadow View, with entrance gates set back 6 m from the road side. An on-site turning head and three parking spaces are proposed to the north of the proposed dwelling.
3.4 The roofline and footprint is varied, considered to represent a building which has grown organically over time.
3.5 Details for a Klargester sewage treatment tank are submitted, indicating their location in the driveway to the north of the proposed dwelling, 5 m from the boundary with the garden to Mayfield.
4.0 HISTORY
4.1 17/02017/FULLS Demolition of existing buildings on site and construction of detached dwelling to include package treatment plant, new access and entrance gates. Refused 02.11.2017.

1. The proposed single dwelling is a bulky single mass, considered intrusive and uncharacteristic, not well integrated into the area character, or the site which is subject to a Woodland Tree Preservation Order, detrimental to this woodland and the surrounding Conservation Area. The proposed dwelling house is considered bulky and unacceptably intrusive contrary to Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policies COM2 and E1.
2. The site provides a green wooded area; subject to Woodland Tree Preservation Order, with mature trees visible from the Clarendon Way and from the Sheepsbridge, which crosses the River Test to the north of the site. It provides a verdant hedgerow alongside the Village street, characteristic of the Conservation area. The loss of a large part of this woodland and road side hedgerow is considered detrimental to the landscape character of the immediate area, contrary to Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policies COM2 and E2.
3. Inadequate survey and mitigation information has been submitted in order for the local planning authority to conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on protected species. The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to policies COM2 and E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.
4. The Bossington and Houghton Conservation Area is characterised by linking roadside hedgerows, such as that providing the roadside boundary for this application site, by this woodland, subject of a Woodland Preservation Order and by a number of roadside Listed Buildings, which retain local design pre-eminence in the street scene. The reduction of these distinctive village features arising from this proposed development is considered unacceptable and detrimental to the character and setting of the Conservation Area, a heritage asset and contrary to Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) policies COM2 and E9.
5. Inadequate survey and mitigation information has been submitted in order for the local planning authority to conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of future occupants of the proposed development, arising from potential overshadowing from the surrounding woodland. The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to policies COM2 and LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
6. The eastward gable end windows for the development subject to this application are within 5 m of the rear garden for Mayfield. Loss of privacy arising from this overlooking is considered detrimental to the amenity of Mayfield and its occupants, and contrary to Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) policies COM2 and LHW4.

Plans associated with this refused application are included in the agenda paper as Appendix A.
4.2 17/01485/TREES Proposal works to trees as per schedule received. Objection.
Woodland TPO. 10.10.2017.
4.3 17/02242/TPOS Carry out various tree works as described in survey schedule submitted with application. Part Consent, part refusal. 17.10.2017.
4.4 TPO.TVBC. 1124 Trees within the boundaries of the woodland area opposite Meadow View and adjacent to Mayfield House, Houghton. 12.10.2017.

### 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Policy Officer- No objection.
5.2 Landscape Officer - No objection subject to conditions concerning planting details, including implementation and subsequent management, and delivering on the front boundary hedge.
5.3 Conservation and Design Officer - No objection subject to conditions.
5.4 Tree Officer - No objections subject to conditions.
5.5 HCC Ecologist - No objection subject to a condition and notes.
5.6 Highways Engineer - No objection subject to conditions.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 24.08.2018
6.1 Houghton Parish Council - Objection (Summarised):

- No housing need for large dwellings. Test Valley has sufficient housing Land Supply. (HLS);
- Village Design Statement and Neighbourhood Plan. (Not yet published).
- Seeks to protect the last green spaces in the village.
- Houghton and Bossington Conservation Document.
- The copse contains 'important trees and groups of trees'. It characterises the village as having distinctive features of interlinking hedgerows and listed buildings close by. The reduction of this distinctive village feature is unacceptable and detrimental to the character and setting of the Conservation Area, contrary to policies COM2 and E9.
- Woodland Preservation Order. This application would involve cutting down valuable trees, losing habitat for the village rookery and impacting on the biodiversity of the wood, thus contravening policy COM2 and E5.
- This development is on the site of the last woodland copse in the village.
- Landscape impact. The development would be visible from Sheepbridge and also lies adjacent to the Clarendon Way. Both are visited regularly by tourists and locals, who appreciate the area and the birdlife and wildlife.
- Development. There have already been significant developments approved by TVBC very close to the site. The area will have changed beyond recognition if the woodland were to be developed with the further loss of green and wildlife abundant spaces.
- Planning History. The Parish Council would like to draw attention to the notice of refusal for 17/02017/FULLS. The reasons for refusal are still applicable to this application.
- Houghton Parish Council objects to this proposal. It contravenes 6 policies of the Revised Local Plan.
6.2 Forty letters of objection have been received from occupants of properties in the village. These objections include:
6.3 Same refusal reasons as the 2017 refused case.

The reasons for refusal last year are still overwhelmingly relevant and the application should be refused again;
6.4 Out of character with landscape of the village-

- This development would have a negative impact on the character of this area of the village;
- A large dwelling in an acknowledged woodland;
- It will be totally out of sympathy with the character of the village;
- The Test Valley generally is a highly manicured area - any small pieces of land which are relatively unspoilt (some would say unkempt) are to be highly valued and protected;
- Villagers do not wish to be living in a suburban style community where all the green spaces and woodland have been built over loss of characteristic roadside hedgerow;
6.5 Biodiversity impact -
- Local residents would like to see the site remain a small wooded area;
- It would be a disaster if the wooded copse and wildlife were destroyed for yet another un needed large property;
- A significant number of trees and other natural environment has been lost to other building works or still planned for this side of Houghton. This copse must be maintained to preserve the habitat and retain some semblance of the rural character of this part of the village;
- The area is so close to the river and it will have its own biological microcosm that should be protected;
- Would seriously affect the bio diversity of the wood which is presently home to the village rookery, has owls and bats in it as well as slow worms, all protected species:
- Loss of valuable green lung \& habitat; loss of habitat for protected species;
- Loss of a significant and rare copse;
- Concerns expressed for the wellbeing of the Rookery and for bats in particular as well as owls and other protected species;
- How can you say that this application will protect or add to, bio-diversity and heritage?
6.6 Loss of defining characteristic of green spaces between properties. -
- Loss of a green space and interlinking hedgerow between listed buildings;
- Loss of a valuable green lung within the village;
6.7 Impact on views from PROW:
- Impacts on views from the Clarendon Way and Sheepsbridge, which are Public Rights of Way;
6.8 No housing need for a further luxury home in the village;
- Need for small affordable dwellings;
- TVBC has publicly states that it has sufficient land for housebuilding for the next 15 years
- There may be good reasons for social or affordable housing, but the current proposal appears to contribute absolutely nothing to the wellbeing of the village.


### 6.9 Over development -

- There is enough development in this end of the village;
- The village has had 28 new houses permitted in the last 3 years, half very close to the site;
- The large proposed dwelling is out of context;
- There are 3 derelict dwellings opposite the site - evidencing no need for this property';
- In recent years the village has had its fair share of large properties being built and the rural village, country soul of Houghton is disappearing.
- The village has seen an approximate $18-20 \%$ increase in houses in the past 5 years which has massively diminished the rural nature of the village;
- Uncharacteristic and not well integrated design.
6.10 Highways impact

Traffic generation, parking and safety.

### 6.11 Lack of amenities for new development

- Lack of light and sunlight - Little natural light arising from building a dwelling within a woodland, with related threat to fell trees subject to TPOs;
- The proposed property, whilst slightly smaller than the previous proposal, would still require the felling of a significant number of mature trees, and would inevitably lead to a gradual clearance of the whole site;
- The village lacks services for more development - doctors; public transport, internet, electricity outages every winter.
6.12 Drainage matters

Normal site conditions are boggy and it will probably be necessary to pile drive the plot to construct footings, with related impacts on the root systems of trees.
6.13 Loss of Woodland subject to a Woodland TPO -

- Would like someone to buy this and keep it maintained as a much needed wooded area this end of the village;
- Threat to fell arising from development in close proximity to mature trees;
- Miss Beales Copse was never residential, it has disused Pigsties on site and has been a woodland for 30 years;
- Loss of a unique small woodland;.
- This particular instance will destroy the last piece of woodland in the village;
- It would involve cutting down a large amount of trees in the middle of the wood and would change the appearance of the wood and the conservation area forever contrary to policies COM2 and E1;
- It would be contrary to the Woodland Preservation Order to cut down mature trees that are visible from the Clarendon Way and Sheepbridge, changing the street scene and conservation area with changes to trees and hedges along the road;
- Little natural light arising from building a dwelling within a woodland, with related threat to fell trees subject to TPOs;
- The proposed property, whilst slightly smaller than the previous proposal, would still require the felling of a significant number of mature trees, and would inevitably lead to a gradual clearance of the whole site;
6.14 Design and the Village Design Statement (lodged with the TVBC)
- States that the land is a significant and rare copse which strongly reinforces the rural character of the village road;
- Building on this land would destroy beyond recognition the last woodland copse in the village.
- The reference to 19-22 south End Cottages, refers to cottages built in 1875 as an interpretation of the Kentish vernacular. Does copying this produce a Hampshire style?


### 6.15 Overlooking and loss of privacy

The positioning of the property means that the front of the house looks directly onto the front of our property with three bedroom windows facing directly into each other, and will adversely affect privacy contrary to policies COM2 and LHW4.
6.16 Impact on this part of the Conservation Area

- This part of the Conservation Area needs to retain this particular wooded area of land which has always had a lot of coppiced wood and large trees;
- the proposed building is out of character with the area;
6.17 Heritage impact - adverse Conservation Area impacts;

The site was owned and used by its original owners of Meadow View as a large vegetable plot, with a pig and pig sty, chicken and a few sheep. There was a long wooded barn alongside the road associated with the livestock.

### 7.0 POLICY

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework 2018(NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### 7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)( TVBRLP) <br> SD1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development <br> COM2 - Settlement hierarchy <br> COM7 - Affordable Housing <br> E1 - High quality development in the Borough <br> E2 - $\quad$ Protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the Borough <br> E5 - Biodiversity <br> E7 - Water management <br> E9 - Heritage <br> LHW4 - Amenity <br> T1 - Managing movement <br> T2 - Parking standards

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Bossington and Houghton Conservation Area 1990.
7.4 Other

Draft Houghton Neighbourhood Plan (Area designation 13.06. 2017).

### 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 - The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development
- Heritage impacts -Conservation Area; Listed Buildings; Archaeology
- Landscape character impact
- Biodiversity Impact
- Design
- Amenity impact
- Highways Impact: Village Road and Clarendon Way
- Drainage impact


### 8.2 The principle of development

The development is located within the settlement boundary of Houghton as set out in the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016. (TVBRLP). Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP states that the principle of development will be permitted provided that it is appropriate to other material planning considerations. Therefore in principle, the development proposal is acceptable. It is not necessary for the applicant to demonstrate, for the purpose of complying with Policy COM02 in this instance that there is a need for the dwelling ("luxury" or "affordable"). Other material considerations are now addressed.

### 8.3 Heritage impacts

Heritage impacts include impacts on the Houghton and Bossington Conservation Area, adjacent listed buildings and on archaeology. Heritage matters are addressed within TVBRLP policy E9: Heritage, which requires development proposals affecting heritage assets to make positive contributions to sustaining or enhancing the significance of the heritage asset, and requires that development proposals are informed through an assessment proportionate to its significance.
8.4 Houghton and Bossington Conservation Area is characterised by key features, including:

- A dispersed linear settlement with hedgerows linking elements between groups of dwellings.
- Important open areas to the east adjacent the River Test.
- Characteristic local estate cottages.
- Views eastwards across the valley of the River Test and from footpaths on the western village edge.
8.5 The key feature characteristic of the Conservation Area on this site is the hedgerow along the road frontage, providing a key linkage for this part of the dispersed linear settlement between Mayfield with Dianthus on the east of the Village Road and dwellings further south. The Woodland is also the remaining woodland in the village, and considered focal within the Conservation Area. The views towards this site are predominantly from the Village Street, Clarendon Way and the Sheepsbridge. It is not currently possible to view the river from within the site, due to its well vegetated Woodland nature.
8.6 The application is submitted with a current Heritage and Townscape Statement, (RMA Heritage, July 2018). This concludes that though recently designated as woodland by the Council, historic research reveals that the site was until relatively recently managed and developed at its northern end, with the site becoming overgrown in recent years. This report suggests that the proposed development would reinforce the historic linear settlement pattern of the village, and will allow the site to retain its treed character.
8.7 The proposal provides a reinstated boundary hedgerow and retains all the southern part of the woodland. The Council's Conservation and Design Officer, the Landscape Officer, and the Tree Officer raise no objection to the proposal. Notably, due to the on-site mature trees, and planned retention, and supplemental planting, the development would not provide new views through
the site to the River Test or Sheepsbridge. Conversely the public appreciation of built development on the site when viewed from the Clarendon Way as one approaches and leaves the Sheepsbridge will also be minimised. The reduction in built form on the site (compared to the refused scheme) and the resultant dwelling appearing in the context of similarly scaled existing dwellings in this vista would, it is considered result in a more sympathetic form of development that would complement the character and appearance of the area.
8.8

| Proposed development | Refused development <br> 17/01953/FULLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11 m maximum width | 13 m maximum width |
| 24 m length | 24 m length |
| No cellar | A cellar 10.5m X 9m |
| Ridge height varies 7.3m, 7.8m \& 8m | Ridge height 8.2 m |
| Single storey utility 3m from southern |  |
| boundary | Two storey dwelling 3m from <br> southern boundary |
| Sewage treatment plant to the north <br> east of the proposed dwelling | Sewage treatment plant to the south <br> of the proposed dwelling |
| Handmade brick exterior elevations | Through render exterior walls |
| Blue engineering brick plinth | Natural coloured sandstone plinth |

The table above clarifies the differences between the two applications on site. The reinstatement of the roadside hedgerow, the tree management proposal and the tree planting discussed in depth further below, are also considered an enhancement of the site's rural and wooded setting. In combination, these aspects are considered to result in a neutral impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, thereby preserving the character and appearance of the area. The development is considered acceptable and in accord with TVBRLP policy E9.

### 8.9 Listed Buildings

The application site is adjacent to a number of listed dwellings. These include Lavender Cottage, Rowans, Thatch Cottage to the south, and Houghton Farm House slightly further north, all listed Grade II and adjacent to the Village Road. Houghton Farm House is a significant former farmhouse, containing the former Village Reading Room, and is considered to have a street presence, with its large focal chimneys and concrete render exterior. The other adjacent listed buildings are well proportioned two storey dwellings, with low eaves, characteristic of estate dwellings of the village.
8.10 These properties have some prominence in the street scene, they are all visible from the Village Street, and are all characteristic of the Estate Cottages of the Conservation Area. It is considered important that they retain their prominence in this Conservation Area. The proposal is for a two storey dwelling house adjacent the Village Street. It will, by virtue of the existing, proposed planting, and the scale, massing and relative detailing that the proposal includes, will have limited visibility in the public domain.
Consequently, the views to and from these Listed building from the development would, it is considered, be limited such that the setting and character of these buildings will be preserved, in accordance with policy E9 of the TVBRLP.

### 8.11 Archaeology

The development is located within the historic core of the village, however, the scale is considered limited in archaeological terms, and raises no archaeological issues.
8.12 Landscape character impact/Impact on Trees.

Landscape character is addressed within TVBRLP policy E2: Protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the Borough. This requires development proposals to protect, conserve and enhance landscape character. An assessment of the related impact arises from the existing character, and how or if, this character is protected, conserved or enhanced.
8.13 The character of the site arises from its woodland nature and road side hedgerow which are seen in the context of the surrounding Conservation Area, with views of the site immediately adjacent from the Village Street, and more distantly, from the Clarendon Way and the Sheepsbridge. The site provides a green wooded area, designated with a Woodland Preservation Order. Mature trees on the site are visible from some distance on the Clarendon Way and from the Sheepsbridge, crossing the River Test to the north of the site, and from the road in front. The site is therefore considered of some landscape significance.
8.14 The application is supported with a Landscape and Visual appraisal Report, (WH Landscape Consultancy Ltd July 2018), which concludes that the proposed development will have no adverse effects on the key characteristics or descriptions of the site and surrounding landscape; such that the type of development proposed does not represent a key issues facing any of the relevant character types or areas. Mitigation measures proposed would integrate the proposed development into the landscape, and would also provide landscape enhancements to the sites landscape structure, in particular the boundary hedgerows and remaining woodland.
8.15 The submitted Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and an Arboricultural Method Statement, dated 1st September 2017, (Barrell July 2018), identify that the trees subject to removal are either of low or moderate category classification, and none form significant skyline features. The report concludes that although the proposed changes will affect trees, subject to appropriate protective measures, the development will have no adverse impact on the contribution of trees to the character in the wider setting. The Tree Officer has discussed this application at length and raises no objection.
8.16 The Tree Survey and Protection Plan submitted, provides an idea of the extent of tree work proposed. Thinning of the woodland is proposed, providing some woodland management. The trees on site have been graded A-C according to the British Standard 5837. This classification provides an indication of the quality of the trees in Arboricultural terms where Grade A represents "High Quality", Grade B "Moderate quality" and Grade C "Low quality". A number of both grade $B$ (3no) and grade C (14no.) trees are shown for removal and a number of Grade B (3no.) and Grade C (3no.) shown for pruning. The report also indicates that it is the intention to provide a total of 16 no. New heavy
standard trees. The Council's tree officer raises no objection to the way in which the trees have been classified, the extent of the tree work/removal or of the nature of the proposed planting to accompany the proposed development. It is considered that the proposed planting plan and the works proposed to the existing trees on site will enable the development to be accommodated on this site without significant detriment to the character and appearance of the area. Indeed the proposed planting will, once properly managed, help in continuing to contribute to a woodland setting to the village. The proposal is therefore considered in accord with the appearance of the immediate area and the landscape character of the area within which it is located, and in accord with TVBRLP policy E2.

### 8.17 Biodiversity Impact

Biodiversity impacts are addressed within TVBRLP policy E5: Biodiversity, which requires development proposals to conserve and where possible, restore and or enhance biodiversity.
8.18 The submitted report, (Aluco, July 2018), provides all ecological mitigation requirements, and matters arising can be conditioned. The application is therefore in accord with TVBRLP policy E5.

### 8.19 Design impact

Design is assessed within TVBRLP policy E1: High quality development in the Borough. This requires development to be of a high quality in terms of design and local distinctiveness, including integrating, respecting and complementing local area character.
8.20 Locally distinctive aspects of design include estate cottages, with relatively low eaves, varied rooflines and low ridgelines.
8.21 The proposed single dwelling appears to have a ridge height similar to those of adjacent properties, particularly Meadow View, Maybury and Southend Cottages. This can be ensured by the application of a levels condition in the recommendation. The proposed development now includes elevational treatment and detailing (see paragraph 8.8), that is considered sympathetic to the settlement.
8.22 The Village Design Statement has not been adopted, therefore the points raised by third parties in this respect, cannot be substantiated. The dwelling would appear as one that has evolved over a period of time. The main part of the dwelling runs perpendicular to the road, with a 'side extension' running parallel to it. This provides an opportunity to break the overall massing of the building up, compared to the previously refused scheme and utilising varied rooflines ensures the building's impact on its surroundings is comparable to those in the vicinity. As previously discussed, when the dwelling is seen in the context that some existing vegetation is maintained, that additional planting is proposed, and that a condition is added to ensure the long term maintenance of the plot in woodland management. The overall design of the dwelling is therefore considered well integrated into the Conservation Area character, carefully adding a well concealed but spacious dwelling within the woodland setting, and considered in accord with TVBRLP policy E1.

### 8.23 Amenity impact

Amenity impact is assessed within TVBRLP policy LHW4: Amenity, which assesses impact on light, sunlight, privacy and related matters. There are two elements to the consideration of these issues. Firstly, the amenity of future residents of the development and secondly, the impact of the proposal on the amenity of existing neighbouring properties.
8.24 Light and sunlight.

The proposal indicates the retention of trees around the dwelling. The application is also accompanied by a Daylight and Sunlight Study, (Right of Light Consulting, July 2018). This report, partly submitted to address concerns under the previously refused planning application and the degree to which light might affect to future occupants of the property, indicates that adequate daylight and sunlight is achieved with this development proposal, in accordance with BRE standards. No detrimental associated loss of light or sunlight derives from the proposal for the neighbouring property, due to the location of the development, at this distance from Mayfield It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with TVBRLP policy LHW4: Amenity in terms of light and sunlight.
8.25 Visual impact of the Sewage treatment plant

The sewage treatment plant location would be approximately 5 m from the garden to Mayfield. The siting of the sewage treatment plant would require some ground clearance and access arrangements, however, the resulting slightly raised disc at ground level within the car park and turning area, is not considered to result in an adverse impact to the amenity of either the future residents of the development or of neighbouring properties.
8.26 Privacy and overlooking

The only dwelling adjacent is Mayfield. The development would clearly introduce a new dwelling about 50m from Mayfield house itself and about 15 from the front garden of Mayfield. These distances are not considered such that any detrimental amenity impact arises from the development, to the front or side elevations of Mayfield. No windows are proposed on the boundary to the rear garden of Mayfield, and no other overlooking issues arise.
8.27 With a 50 m distance between Mayfield and the proposed dwelling house, it is considered that no significant detrimental loss of privacy or overlooking arises for the occupants of the future development from occupants of Mayfield.

### 8.28 Highways Impact:

Highways impact is assessed within TVBRLP policies T1: Managing Movement and T2: Parking Standards. These require appropriate provision of access and parking and turning areas.
8.29 The access/egress point into the site is clearly indicated on the submitted drawings. Adequate visibility splays are provided to ensure a safe means of accessing and egressing from the development. The point of access leads into an area dedicated to the parking and manoeuvring of cars. The space available can accommodate the required car parking spaces to serve the dwelling (as per the parking standards in the TVBRLP). The proposal would not, subject to appropriate conditions, therefore give rise to acceptable solution with regard to highway safety.

### 8.30 Drainage impact

Drainage and water management matters are addressed in TVBRLP policy E7: Water Management. This requires development to not result in deterioration of water quality, nor to result in risk in terms of ground water quality or flooding
8.31 The submission is made with indicative details of a Sewage Treatment Plant, (STP). The siting of the STP is indicated on submitted plans, and final, technical details would be dealt with at Building Control stage.
8.32 The development is required to be designed and built to meet Regulation 362 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency as set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015. This is in the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016. This requirement can be provided for within a condition.
8.33 Subject to a condition in respect of water consumption at the property, to ensure compliance with TVBRLP policy E7 Water management, the proposal is considered to accord with this Policy.

### 8.34 Other matters

While noting that Houghton has been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan Area, a Neighbourhood Plan has not been adopted at this moment in time. Consequently no weight can be afforded to this matter in the determination of this application. Likewise, The Houghton Village Design Guide is in draft form, and has not been adopted. Consequently little weight can be afforded to this draft document.

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed dwelling is considered to represent an acceptable form of development for this site and accords with the relevant policies of the TVBRLP. The applicant has responded to the previously refused scheme by reducing the overall scale, massing and appearance of the dwelling and utilised 'visual' (roof heights, eaves height, materials etc) and 'physical' measures (recessing the 'extension' from the front face of the dwelling) to achieve this. The proposal is accompanied by details of proposed tree loss, and suitable replacement planting to maintain a visual, woodland contribution to the Houghton street scene following construction. Achieving these measures is important to not only to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, but also assist in integrating the new dwelling into the street scene. Subject to appropriate conditions securing both planting and long term maintenance of the wooded area the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and assists in preserving the setting of nearby Listed buildings.
9.2 The proposal is also acceptable with regard to highway safety, the amenity of nearby neighbours, and the amenity of future occupants of the dwelling, biodiversity matters, drainage and water supply, in accordance with the policies of the TVBRLP. The proposal is considered acceptable.

## 10.0 <br> RECOMMENDATION <br> 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 plans, numbers: 16/291/02 Rev. G; 16/291/03 Rev. H; 17347-BT7. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.
4. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until Woodland Management Plan, and a schedule of implementation and maintenance for a minimum period of $\mathbf{2 0}$ years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for the phasing of the implementation and ongoing maintenance during that period in accordance with appropriate British Standards or other recognised codes of practise. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.
Reason: To ensure the provision, retention and maintenance to a suitable standard of approved woodland to maintain and enhance the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and to contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E2.
5. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details, including plans and cross sections, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course in relation thereto. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure satisfactory relationship between the new development and the adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policies E1 and E9.
6. The development hereby approved shall be designed and built to meet Regulation 362 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015.
Reason: In the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
7. At least the first 6 metres of the access track measured from the nearside edge of carriageway of the adjacent highway shall be surfaced in a non-migratory material prior to the use of the access commencing and retained as such at all times.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
8. Any gates shall be set back at least 6 metres from the edge of the carriageway of the adjoining highway and the access shall be splayed at an angle of 45 degrees from this point to the edge of the highway.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
9. Prior to the first occupation of the building hereby permitted, the car parking space(s), turning and manoeuvring area shall be constructed, surfaced and laid out in accordance with the approved plans. The area of land so provided shall be maintained at all times for this purpose.
Reason: To ensure sufficient off-street parking has been provided and in the interest of highways safety in accordance with the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016 Policies T1 and T2.
10. Prior to the commencement of development full details of the layout for the parking and manoeuvring on site of contractor's and delivery vehicles during the construction period shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of development and retained for the duration of the construction period.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety and in the interest of protecting Trees subject to a Woodland Preservation Order in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policies T1 and E2.
11. Prior to the commencement of development the visibility splays, reference Plan 16/291/03 Rev. H shall be provided. Nothing within the approved visibility splays shall exceed 1 metre above the level of the adjacent carriageway (including the land level and any walls, fences and vegetation). Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) these visibility splays shall be maintained in accordance with the above details at all times.
Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
12. Development shall proceed in accordance with the measures set out in section 6.1 'Mitigation' of the Ecological Assessment- Interim Report Land at Meadow View, Houghton' (Aluco Ecology, June 2018).

Reason: To avoid impacts to protected and notable species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan DPD.
13. All works to existing trees, together with the provision of new tree planting, and new boundary hedging (including the new hedge along the road frontage of the dwelling) shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in Drw.No.17347-BT7 (Barrell Tree Consulting) prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.
Reason: To ensure that only appropriate works to the trees identified on this plan are undertaken, and that suitable planting takes place on-site in a timely manner, to ensure an appropriate tree cover remains following construction of the new dwelling, to protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough revised Local plan (2016).
14. Prior to development taking place tree protective fencing shall be erected in accordance with the details contained in Drw.No.17347BT7 (Barrell Tree Consulting), the "Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement" (Ref: 17347-AA6-PB), and the report "Manual for Managing Trees on development sites" (Barrell Tree Consulting). The tree protective measures shall be retained on site for the full duration of the construction activity.
Reason: To ensure that suitable tree protection has been erected prior to work being undertaken on site to minimise the chance of accidental damage to trees, and that appropriate tree cover remains following construction of the new dwelling, to protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy E9 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. Birds' nests, when occupied or being built, and the widespread species of reptile receive legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). It is highly advisable to undertake clearance of potential bird nesting habitat (such as hedges, scrub, trees, suitable outbuildings etc.) outside the bird nesting season, which is generally seen as extending from March to the end of August, although may extend longer depending on local conditions. If there is absolutely no alternative to doing the work in during this period then a thorough, careful and quiet examination of the affected area must be carried out before clearance starts. If occupied nests are present then work must stop in that area, a suitable (approximately 5 m ) stand-off maintained, and clearance can
only recommence once the nest becomes unoccupied of its own accord. Reptile habitat such as compost heaps should be carefully cleared by hand during warmer months as if hibernating reptiles are disturbed they will die. Any reptiles revealed should be moved to adjacent retained rougher / boundary habitat or allowed to move off of their own accord.
3. 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.
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## ITEM 9

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/02170/FULLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 14.08 .2018 |
| APPLICANT | Mr and Mrs Grahamsley And Mr S Watson |
| SITE | Bracken Wood, Jermyns Lane, Ampfield, SO51 0QA, |
|  | ROMSEY EXTRA |
| PROPOSAL | Erection of dwelling and garage and installation of |
|  | package treatment plant |
| AMENDMENTS | Tree Method Statement - 13.09.2018 |
| CASE OFFICER | Miss Sarah Barter |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason to debate policy issues.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application site is located on the southern side of Jermyns Lane and outside the settlement boundary of Romsey and Ampfield. The site is located in a verdant area to the east of the existing dwelling on generally level land.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The application proposes the construction of a dwelling and detached garage together with a sewage treatment plant.
4.0 HISTORY
4.1 18/01052/FULLS - Construction of detached dwelling with garage and installation of package treatment plant - Withdrawn - 12.06.2018

- Contrary to policy.
- Objection from highways.
4.2 17/02980/FULLS - Re-siting of existing access - Permission subject to conditions and notes - 17.01.2018
4.3 17/01553/FULLS - Redevelopment of site to provide nine detached dwellings; retention of existing property with new garaging and access road - Withdrawn - 18.09.2017
- Contrary to policy.
- Objections from Landscaping, trees, Highways, and ecology.
4.4 15/02558/FULLS - Erection of 9 five bedroom dwellings with garages, access and sewage treatment plant - Withdrawn - 25.02.2016
- Contrary to policy.
- Objections from Landscaping, trees, Highways, and ecology.
4.5 TVS.06444/3 - Demolition of Bracken Lodge and erection of one 4-bedroom detached dwelling - Refuse - 03.11.1998
4.6 TVS.06444/2 - Temporary siting of 2 mobile homes as one unit of accommodation during construction of replacement dwelling - 23.09.1994- Temp permission.
4.7 TVS.06444/1 - Demolition of Brackenwood and approved replacement dwellingand erection of new dwelling with granny annex - 12.12.1994 - Permissionsubject to conditions and notes.
4.8 TVS. 06444 - Replacement dwelling and garage - 28.03.1991 - Permission subject to conditions and notes.
5.0 CONSULTATIONS
5.1 Policy - Objection:The principle of the proposal is contrary to the adopted Local Plan, thereforefurther consideration would need to be given as to whether there is anyreasonable justification for departure from the development plan. Furtherconsideration of this is set out below.
5.2 Landscape - No Objection.
5.3 Trees - No Objection subject to condition.
5.4 Ecology - No Concerns subject to condition and New Forest SPA payment.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 25.05.2018
6.1 Romsey Extra Parish Council - No Objection.
6.2 Ampfield Parish Council (adjacent parish) - Objection:
- Development contrary to policy COM2.
- Contrary to Ampfield VDS - sets out guidelines that ensure that thedistinctive character of the parish is retained and enhanced.
7.0 POLICY
7.1 Government Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)
COM2 (Settlement Hierarchy), E1 (High Quality Development in the Borough), E2 (Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough), E5 (Biodiversity), E7 (Water Management), E8 (Pollution), E9 (Heritage), LHW4 (Amenity), T1 (Managing Movement), T2 (Parking Standard).
7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)
Ampfield Village Design Statement


### 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning considerations are the principle for development, character of the area, highways, protected species \& ecology, amenity, and trees.

### 8.2 Principle of development

The application site is, for the purposes of planning policy, within the countryside. The application site is not allocated for development in the currently saved policies of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016. The principle planning policy of the RLP therefore is policy COM2. Planning policy COM2 seeks to restrict development outside of settlement boundaries unless identified within the specified policies as being appropriate or where a countryside location is required.
8.3 It is not considered that it is a type appropriate in the countryside (criterion a) or that there is an essential need for the proposal to be located in the countryside (criterion b). However other material considerations need to be taken into account which could justify a departure from the saved policies of the development plan.
8.4 The National Planning Policy Framework and Sustainable Development The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in the assessment of planning applications. The NPPF identifies the three dimensions of sustainable development which should be taken into account, i.e. social, economic and environmental roles (paragraph 8). Paragraph 7 states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. For the assessment of planning applications, this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. As noted above, the principle of additional housing in this countryside location is considered to be contrary to the guidance set out in Policy COM2. The site was not allocated for development within the Revised Local Plan as an allocation site. The proposal is therefore not considered to be in accordance with the development plan.

### 8.5 Housing Land Supply

The HLS position for Southern Test Valley, as at 1st April 2018 is 7.97 years of supply, reported against a target of 5.00 years. The existence of a five year HLS enables the Council to give weight to the policies of the adopted plan (in the context of paragraph 73 of the NPPF) which is considered to be up-to-date. However, the demonstration of a five year HLS does not in itself represent a cap to development and any application must be assessed on its merits.

### 8.6 Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016

The Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (Local Plan) was adopted on 27 January 2016, following being found legally compliant and sound through the examining Inspector's report dated 15 December 2016. This includes an assessment of consistency with national policy, which was satisfied by the adopted Local Plan.

### 8.7 Neighbouring Planning Permissions

The submitted Design and Access Statement specifically under part 2.4, local development, makes reference to recent development in the area. This includes land at, Abbotsford, and Ganger Farm which is not allocated for residential development and states this is contrary to policy SET03.
8.8 The council has considered the planning applications referred to above. This includes 14/01090/FULLS (Ganger Farm, currently under construction), and 16/03103/FULLS (Abbotsford, refused by TVBC, allowed at appeal, currently under construction). Both sites fall outside of the settlement boundaries contrary to policy COM2.
8.9 The extant permission for the development of neighbouring sites is a material consideration in determining the application. The permission in place for Ganger Farm was determined to be sustainable, and weighs in favour of the application, however, it is not considered to outweigh the considerations given above. The application at Ganger Farm in particular has economic benefits for example from the skills training to the new homes bonus. The social gains were also significant with the provision of sports facilities, open space, and housing, including affordable housing. It was also considered that the environmental effects of the development would be balanced, but that with the various mitigation and compensation measures proposed, the proposal would result in environmental gains. Furthermore this proposal also provided some sustainable gains with the pedestrian, cycle and highway network improvements improving the connectivity of the site.
8.10 The application at Abbotsford was allowed at appeal (ref: 3170081). The Inspector determined that there was some weight to environmental benefits including biodiversity enhancement, new tree and hedge planting, and new pedestrian and cycle routes which would improve accessibility and would encourage non car modes of transport. With regards the social gains the proposal at Abbotsford would provide additional housing including 40\% affordable which would ensure the size and tenure of the proposed dwellings would meet the local need. The Inspector attached substantial weight to these social benefits in favour of the appeal. Economic benefits were considered to come in the form of employment and additional spending power resulting from the construction phase and from future occupiers of the development. The inspector applied significant weight to this benefit. Whilst the Inspector found that the appeal conflicted with the development plan as a whole the benefits of the appeal were considered weighty and the appeal was allowed.
8.11 The summary submitted within the site analysis of the Design and Access Statement, 2.4, considers the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 out of date and has referenced SET03. This is a policy in the old Local Plan from 2016. Policy COM2 is the current relevant policy in the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016 and there is no evidence provided by the applicant that is persuasive that policy COM2 is out of date. The reasoning set above highlights the benefits of each scheme and why the schemes were acceptable in this respect.

### 8.12 Bracken Wood site and sustainable development

Paragraph 4.4 'Site' of the design proposal submitted argues that the site is in relatively close proximity to services contained within garden centres and bus stops within a 3 min walk to the centre of Ampfield which give access to numerous shops and services. The services provided at a garden centre are not considered to amount to fundamental services like for example doctors surgeries, convenience stores, or post offices. Furthermore it is unclear where the centre of Ampfield with numerous shops and services is. There are no footpaths on this part of Jermyns Lane. Within the Revised Local Plan 2016 Ampfield is divided into east and west demonstrating how sprawling the parish is. There is a sports ground and public house located on the A3090 between Winchester and Romsey but the numerous shops and services are lacking. Whilst this opinion is noted the site is nevertheless isolated from shops, services and means of transport other than the use of a private car to access them. The site is not locationally sustainable which reinforces the 'countryside' allocation in the Test Valley Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.
8.13 The submission discusses social and economic benefits in the form of the applicant being able to self-build the house and not have to fund the purchase of the land due to it being within there ownership. It is argued that this would outweigh the notion that all new housing should be in significantly more urban locations and that the development therefore accords to paragraph 5.49 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016 policy COM2.
8.14 The applicants are not on the self build list held by the LPA. The application submission provides no commentary on why the development would be acceptable in relation to self build legislation and in any event this type of build would still need to comply with the Borough Local Plan 2016.
8.15 Information submitted with the application explains that the applicants have resided in the immediate vicinity for the majority of there lives and wish to stay close together to be able to care for each other in their older years whilst gaining privacy from each other. As such they should be given the opportunity to build a high quality large detached dwelling. Where the applicant was brought up and where their family still live is not a material consideration. It is considered that the individual's needs with regard to being a local family that want to stay in the area does not alter how this application is to be determined. Their requirements in this respect are considered to comment to a desire, rather than an 'essential' requirement. The proposal fails to comply with policy COM2.
8.16 Taking into account the examples given above, the paragraph numbers of the NPPF referred to within the submitted documentation which relate to the 2012 NPPF and not the updated July 2018 version, overall the proposed development at Brackenwood remains unacceptable in principle having regard for the current Revised Borough Local Plan. Other considerations are set out as follows.

### 8.17 Character and Appearance

The current character of the area in close proximity to the site is in the form of nurseries to the west and south at Hilliers and large domestic dwellings to the east and north, with the Wooded Registered Park and Garden at Hilliers and arboretum to the north west. The site is open grassed land/pasture with wooded edges especially to the east. The frontage trees are within a garden frontage and are a TPO area and are of significance, contributing to the character of Jermyn's lane. The large domestic plots as existing have generous gardens and are in dense wooded settings with some clearings in garden areas.
8.18 Due to the existing landscaping along Jermyns lane, and the set back into the plot there will not be views of the proposal that will cause any detrimental impact or cause impact to the wooded character of the area. Whilst the proposal reduces Bracken Woods plot size, it does not do so detrimentally, and the informal wooded character is retained. Landscaping is proposed to create and reinforce boundaries between the existing and proposed properties, and are in line with planting suitable for the local character. An LVA is provided which is agreed with in conclusion: In landscape terms, the prevailing woodland character of the Site would be maintained and enhanced through additional native tree and shrub planting and selective management where appropriate.
8.19 Had the recommendation been for permission conditions would have been added to the decision ensuring this landscaping was provided to accord with policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

### 8.20 Layout and design

The plot easily accommodates the two storey dwelling proposed whilst ensuring space is retained around the boundaries which is consistent with the two closest neighbouring properties at Keepers Cottage and Stornoway Park. Had the recommendation been for permission a condition would have been added to the application for samples of materials to ensure the appearance of a high quality development was achieved. Subject to this condition the development would have been in accordance with policy E1 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

### 8.21 Impact on trees

There is a woodland belt along the road frontage subject to woodland TPO and of considerable public amenity significance. There are also trees and woodland elsewhere on site not currently subject to TPO which are of a lesser public amenity value but still of significance in adding to the overall sylvan character of this area. The Woodland further east, over the site boundary is subject to TPO.
8.22 The trees on site are subject to Barrell Tree Consultancy arboricultural assessment report 15316-AA3-AS and method statement which the Tree Officer is satisfied presents a fair and reasonable reflection of the trees and the constraints they represent.
8.23 This offers appropriate advice on securing tree protection during the build including details for the proposed no-dig driveway. Subject to relevant conditions the Tree Officer is satisfied that the development could be provided without significant impacts on the trees on site and therefore the development would be in accordance with policy E2 of the Revised Borough Local Plan.

### 8.24 Amenity

Given the presence of a large number of trees on site and space between developments it is not considered that the development would have any significant impact in terms of the amenity of the occupants of the dwellings or neighbouring properties. As such in this respect the development would be considered to be in accordance with policy LHW4 of the RLP.

### 8.25 Highways

A recent application has been approved (18/02980/FULLS) to create a new access point into Bracken Wood as existing and this same access point is proposed to be used for the proposed dwelling. The Highways Officer had no objection to this proposed access subject to appropriate conditions include the construction of a visibility splay, the closing of the existing access, and the provision of a non migratory surface. Had the recommendation been for permission it would have been considered appropriate to secure the works set out under the extant permission prior to any development commencing under this application. Subject to a condition ensuring this is provided it is considered that the development could be provided in accordance with policies T1 and T2 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

### 8.26 Ecology

On-site biodiversity
The County Ecologist has made various comments on previous submissions at this site and ecological survey and assessment work has been worked up and developed over recent years. Overall, there now has been a good deal of survey work carried out at the application site and the wider Bracken Wood site. It is important that any applications at a site such as this, set in an ecologically-rich area and with potentially a wide range of sensitive habitats and species present, is supported by thorough ecological survey work. Having reviewed the most recent work (submitted with this application) and having discussed the site with the applicants ecologist on a previous occasion, the County Ecologist is now confident that there is sufficient ecological information to be able to assess this application.
8.27 The current proposal, for a single new dwelling, appears to have been to a large extent designed to avoid taking out further trees in this large well-wooded plot and some of the more ecologically-sensitive areas have been retained, and impacts avoided. This is welcomed. Nevertheless, the development would result in adverse impacts to biodiversity. The major issue at the site is the population of slow worms identified within the development footprint. The ecology report does include a broad-ranging and properly-considered strategy to avoid, mitigate and compensate for impacts and to provide a level of biodiversity gain at the site. With reference to the reptiles, the population at the application site will be moved to an area of similar habitat within the applicants ownership in the wider Bracken Wood site. Previous survey work at the site demonstrates that this nearby area is capable of sustaining the translocated population. Therefore, provided the mitigation measures set out in the report
and are secured by planning condition and subsequently implemented, the County Ecologist would raise no concerns over this proposal. Subject to a condition the development could be provided in accordance with policy E5 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.
8.28 Internationally designated sites - New Forest SPA

The development will result in a net increase in residential dwellings within 13.6 km of the New Forest SPA. This distance defines the zone identified by recent research where new residents would be considered likely to visit the New Forest. The New Forest SPA supports a range of bird species that are vulnerable to impacts arising from increases in recreational use of the Forest that result from new housing development. While clearly one new house on its own would not result in any significant effects, it has been demonstrated through research, and agreed by Natural England that any net increase (even single or small numbers of dwellings) would have a likely significant effect on the SPA when considered in combination with other plans and projects.
8.29 To address this issue, Test Valley Borough Council has adopted an interim mitigation strategy has been agreed that would fund the delivery of a new strategic area of alternative recreational open space that would offer the same sort of recreational opportunities as those offered by the New Forest. Therefore it is considered necessary and reasonable to secure the appropriate contributions. No agreement is in place to secure to the contributions and a reason for refusal has been applied.

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal represents unjustified development in the countryside for which there is no overriding need. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy COM2 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan (2016) and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
9.2 The proposed development is contrary to policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan, the New Forest Special protection area (SPA) interim mitigation framework and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 in that no contribution is provided in order to address the impact of the development on the New Forest SPA resulting in the development having an unmitigated additional burden.

### 10.0 RECOMMENDATION REFUSE for the reasons:

1. The proposal represents unjustified development in the countryside for which there is no overriding need. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy COM2 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan (2016) and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development is contrary to policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan, the New Forest Special protection area (SPA) interim mitigation framework and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 in that no contribution is provided in order to address the impact of the development on the New Forest SPA resulting in the development having an unmitigated additional burden.


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
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## ITEM 10

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/01811/FULLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 16.07 .2018 |
| APPLICANT | Mr and Mrs Chohan |
| SITE | 9 Partry Close, Chandlers Ford, SO53 4SS, VALLEY |
|  | PARK |
| PROPOSAL | Single storey rear extension, following demolition of |
|  | existing conservatory |
| AMENDMENTS | None |
| CASE OFFICER | Mr Nathan Glasgow |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason of neighbour amenities.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 A two storey detached dwelling located in the north-east corner of Partry Close, within Valley Park.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 A single storey pitched roof extension to the rear, following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The existing conservatory measures at 3.00 m deep $x 3.70 \mathrm{~m}$ wide, with a ridge height of 3.20 m . The proposed extension would 5.00 m deep $\times 6.60 \mathrm{~m}$ wide; the ridge height reaches 3.30 m while the eaves are at 2.30 m .
4.0 HISTORY
4.1 18/01254/CLPS - Certificate of Lawful Development for a garage conversion, loft conversion, rear dormer and infill of recess - Certificate issued 11.07.2018.
4.2 TVS. 08445 - Erection of conservatory to rear of property - Permission 29.09.2018.
4.3 TVS.04431/21 - Erection of 20 houses and garages - Permission 23.02.1987.
5.0 CONSULTATIONS
5.1 Ecology - No objection.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 14.08.2018
6.1 Valley Park Parish Council - Objection.
6.2 Nos. 8, 10 and 11 Partry Close - Objections:

- Overlooking
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Over-development
- Noise


### 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) <br> COM2: Settlement Hierarchy

E1: High Quality Development in the Borough
E5: Biodiversity
LHW4: Amenity
T2: Parking Standards

### 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area
- Biodiversity
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Parking provision


### 8.2 Principle of development <br> The application site is located within the settlement boundary of Valley Park, as defined by the Inset Maps of the Revised Local Plan. Development is acceptable in principle under Policy COM2 provided that the proposal accords with other relevant policies.

8.3 Impact on the character of the area

The proposed extension would be located at the rear of the property and is single storey in size and would not be visible from any public view points. The pitched roof extension would utilise similar materials to those existing on the property and is considered to be subservient to the host dwelling. The proposal is considered to integrate and complement the character of the area in terms of appearance, scale and materials. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy E1.

### 8.4 Biodiversity

Due to the age and location of the property, it is considered that there is no reasonable likelihood that bats would be present and/or affected. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy E5.

### 8.5 Impact on neighbouring amenity

As referred to in paragraph 3.1, the proposed extension would be 10 cm higher at the ridge than the existing conservatory. The proposed extension would be wider than the existing, which would bring the side elevations closer to the neighbours on both sides. A side window is proposed to the eastern elevation of the extension, which is 2.00 m high at its highest point; however, the existing boundary treatment, which consists of approximately 1.80 m high close board fence, is considered to provide sufficient screening and would prevent any overlooking from the side window to below acceptable levels towards No. 10.
8.6 The extension also proposes a number of roof lights, with 2 to the west-facing roof slope and 3 to the east-facing roof slope. When stood within the garden of No.8, the property to the north-west, it is considered that there would be no impact whatsoever from the proposed roof lights. The extension does not extend further than the building line of No. 8 and the angle between the houses suggests that there would be no direct overlooking from the roof lights (the roof lights are 2.70 m high).
8.7 The three roof lights to the west-facing roof slope would not provide any overlooking to the garden area of No. 10 due to the height of the roof lights. The proposal was viewed by the Case Officer from the first floor rear window of No. 10 in lieu of concerns raised that the roof lights would provide overlooking to these bedroom windows. Although the roof lights would be in clear sight from the bedroom windows, the roof lights would be at a height and angle that it would be extremely difficult to provide direct looking in to the first floor window. This is also true in reverse; it is considered that the size and angle of the roof lights are such that the occupants on No. 10 would not be able to look directly in through the roof lights and that privacy and amenity is maintained to both the applicants and the neighbours at No.10.
8.8 The extension is located to the north of the application site and is single storey in size. The neighbour to the north-west (No.8) would not be impacted by a reduction in the levels of sunlight and daylight due to the extension not reaching beyond the existing build line of No.8. The location of the properties in question is such that there is not likely to be any reduction in daylight and sunlight to the neighbour to the east (No.10). The existing property and No. 8 are both two storey detached dwellings, and their existing built form provide shadowing that would encompass any shadowing provided by the extension; there would not be any further shadow cast by the extension. There is a small gap between the two properties where sun could protrude and be screened by the extension; however this is only a 2.4 m wide gap and is not considered proportionate to any reduction in levels of daylight and sunlight. The proposal is not considered to reduce the levels of daylight and sunlight to the application site or the neighbouring properties, and neither is it considered would there be a reduction in privacy and amenity levels to the occupants and those of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy LHW4.

### 8.9 Parking provision

The proposal does not include the provision of an additional bedroom and as such there is no requirement for additional off-road parking to be provided. However, the application is supported by a parking plan which suggests that three vehicles can be parked off-road, and is in accordance with the requirements of a 4+ bed property. The proposal is in accordance with Policy T2.
8.10 Other matters:

Objections have been received by both the Parish Council and a number of local residents, and these are discussed below:
8.11 Previous planning decisions creating over-development

The issue of over-development from "a number of previous applications" has been raised. As from within the planning history with Section 4 of this report, there has been only one planning application/permission lodged since the initial planning permission granted the construction of the house. Application reference TVS. 08445 granted permission for a rear conservatory, which is to be replaced within this planning permission. There has also recently been a Certificate of Lawful Development application which has been submitted and issued also. This is not a planning application and the Council does not grant planning permission for these types of applications. A Certificate of Lawful Development, in this specific case, will only certify that a proposal is within Permitted Development Rights at the date the application was submitted. Any reference to this certificate would not be relevant within this planning application as the works have not yet been undertaken and do not require planning permission. As such, it is not considered that this proposal could be considered as over-development of the site due to the small nature in development (only $18 \%$ of the garden area), and with a minimum of 12 m length of garden maintained, the size and scale of the proposal/existing property providing sufficient garden space retained for the host property.

### 8.12 Loss of light

As referred to within Section 8 of this report, it is not considered that this single storey extension would provide any reduction in the amount of natural daylight and/or sunlight entering adjoining properties and their gardens. Its size and location, in combination with the layout of the existing two storey dwellings, suggests that there would not be any additional shadow cast to neighbouring properties or provide areas where natural daylight would be diminished.

### 8.13 Development is not "in-keeping"

The character of Partry Close is one of large two storey detached dwellings with good sized gardens (it is noted that due to the layout of the street, gardens vary in size from plot to plot). However, the replacement of an existing conservatory to be replaced with a single storey extension which utilises matching materials is considered to be a positive design towards maintaining the character of the area.

### 8.14 Overshadowing

A resident (No.11) has concerns of overshadowing. No. 11 is two doors down from the application site and the distance from the extension would be just less than 13 m . At this distance, and the size and scale of the extension, it is not considered overshadowing would be possible.

### 8.15 Noise

Concern has been raised regarding an increase in noise, due to the extensions use as a kitchen/dining/lounge area. Noise in these circumstances is a natural by-product of a dwelling and no control can be had as to reducing noise levels.
8.16 Reference to the previous Certificate of Lawful Development

Reference has been made with regards to the approved 18/01254/CLPS and how it impacts upon this application, such as over-looking from the proposed dormer windows. As stated within paragraph 8.11, reference to this application is not material as this is simply a certificate to confirm that what is proposed is permitted development and considered acceptable under government legislation; the development also has not been built, with no guarantee it would be. As such it is only possible to discuss the merits of this planning application, whereby rear dormers can not be considered and therefore would not be described as over-development. It is also noted that concern is raised over the way these applications have been submitted; however the correct way to confirm whether a development is permitted development would be to apply for a Certificate of Lawful Development, as planning permission would not be required. This application is submitted as is, because the development is not permitted development and requires planning permission.

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) policies.

### 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 numbers:
Existing Plans - 001 Rev A
Proposed Plans - 006 Rev A
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. The external materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match in type, colour and texture those used in the existing building.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship of the new development with the existing in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.

Note 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.





## ITEM 11

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/02090/FULLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 07.08 .2018 |
| APPLICANT | Mr and Mrs M Parrott |
| SITE | 29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 |
|  | 1NF, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR |
| PROPOSAL | Single storey rear extension to provide an extended |
|  | kitchen |
| AMENDMENTS | None |
| CASE OFFICER | 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 interest.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site is located within the settlement of West Tytherley. The Grade II listed building is a detached two storey property of timber frame and brick infill with thatched roof and white timber. Development has occurred to the rear of the property resulting in a two storey extension with thatched roof, and a single storey slate roof lean-to. Parking is situated to the rear. Boundary treatment to the front and side elevation is hedging of varying heights.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 Single storey rear extension to provide an extended kitchen joining onto the existing slate roof lean-to measuring 5.6 metres by 3.8 metres, with a ridge height of 3.8 metres and eaves of 2.2 metres. The applicant has confirmed in writing that the lean-to is slowly deteriorating showing signs of damp and has a parasite infestation.

### 4.0 HISTORY

4.1 18/01046/FULLS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C REFUSE 08.06.2018
Item was presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee on the $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ June 2018.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.2 18/01047/LBWS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C REFUSE 08.06.2018

Item was presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee on the $6^{\text {th }}$ June 2018.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.3 Figure 1 below shows the proposed plan for the previously refused scheme 18/01046/FULLS and the associated listed building consent application 18/01047/LBWS.


Figure 1: Previously refused scheme under applications 18/01046/FULLS and 18/01047/LBWS.
4.4 18/00294/FULLS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C REFUSED 29.01.2018
Decision was issued under Delegated Authority.
Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.5 18/00295/LBWS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C and removal of existing external wall of 'lean to' REFUSED 29.01.2018 Decision was issued under Delegated Authority.
Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets
(listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.6 Figure 2 below shows the proposed plan for the previously refused scheme 18/00294/FULLS and the associated listed building consent application 18/00295/LBWS.


Figure 2: Previously refused scheme under application 18/00294/FULLS and 18/00295/LBWS.

### 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Conservation: Objection:

The cottage is timber framed and thatched and dates from the C17. At the rear is a small brick wing of the C18, also thatched. At the rear of the timber framed part is a slate-roofed brick lean-to, described as approximately 50 years old. The latter may have replaced a similar earlier lean-to structure as the footprint of the cottage as shown on late C19 OS maps is similar to the present one. This is a traditional means of extending vernacular buildings.

As a listed building the cottage is a designated heritage assets as is the conservation area in which it is situated.

The proposal is to add a single-storey kitchen extension to the rear, attaching it to the existing single-storey lean-to. In itself it would be of traditional form and materials, of painted brick and with a hipped tile roof. However, as a form of extension to such a cottage it would not represent a traditional approach, and in this case would be harmful to the significance of the listed cottage as a heritage asset. The existing lean-to addition is a traditional method of
extending vernacular buildings of this type. The proposals retain this but the addition would be positioned in front of it, largely negating its visual contribution to the building's character. The proposed extension would not be integrated well with the existing building and, indeed, would have the appearance of a free-standing building which happens to be attached to the cottage.

It is considered that it will not be possible to achieve an extension providing the accommodation required by the applicants in this location without resulting in harm to the significance of the heritage assets. There would be no public benefits sufficient to offset this harm.
5.2 Ecology: No concerns - subject to note.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 13.09.2018
6.1 Parish Council: No comment.

## $6.25 \times$ letters of support (summarised):

- No visual impact on any neighbouring properties or the road.
- Current kitchen not suitable as cold and damp.
- Improving the listed cottage will ensure its survival.
- Opposite application site is a modern utilitarian residential social housing block and village shop.
- The proposal has no real impact on our local landscape.
- Proposal represents a significant improvement to the essential amenities of the cottage.
- Support the application as a sensible compromise between the quality demands of sustainable modern family life and the aesthetic demands of the local development plan.
- Wholly appropriate improvement to a building which is in essential need of improvement to its basic facilities.
- Proposed upgrade is absolutely essential to create a viable living space and modern family home, whilst maintaining the listed property as an asset to the village and the local community.
- Crucial for houses this age to be updated to meet the needs of family life.
- Without updating there is a real danger that these houses will fall into disrepair, as they will not be suitable for modern family living.
- Without us looking after these character properties village characteristics are in danger of being lost forever.
- The proposal will have minimal visual impact on the house from most aspects but will make it a much more viable family home.


### 7.0 POLICY

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

### 7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP) <br> Policy COM2 - Settlement Hierarchy <br> Policy E1 - High Quality Development in the Borough <br> Policy E5 - Biodiversity <br> Policy E9 - Heritage <br> Policy LHW4 - Amenity <br> 7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) <br> West Tytherley - Conservation Area Policy <br> 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS <br> 8.1 The main planning considerations are: <br> - Principle of Development <br> - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 <br> - Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Listed Building <br> - Impact on the Conservation Area <br> - Impact on biodiversity <br> - Impact on amenity <br> 8.2 Principle of Development <br> The site is located within the settlement boundary of West Tytherley as designated by the Inset Maps of the TVBRLP. Therefore, the proposal is acceptable in principle and in accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP, subject to its assessment against the relevant policies below.

### 8.3 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty on decision makers in considering whether to grant consent for works that affect a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural interest which it possess.
8.4 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess. Considerable weight must therefore be given to the preservation of the listed building, including its setting.
8.5 The House of Lords in South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment case decided that the "statutorily desirable object of preserving the character or appearance of an area is achieved either by a positive contribution to preservation or by development which leaves character of appearance unharmed, that is to say preserved.

### 8.6 Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Listed Building

The character and appearance of the area is traditional in the use of materials and building style. The neighbouring properties of Nutshall Cottage, The Dove House, Collarmakers, and Village Farm are examples of this whereby the use
of timber frame with white brick infill is prominent with roof types of thatch and clay tile. The current proposal features brick painted white with reclaimed red/brown clay tiles. The white painted brick will match the existing dwelling house, while the red/brown tile is a material not used on the existing thatched dwelling house but is present on the outbuilding to the rear.
8.7 The proposed roof design is considered to adversely impact the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house. It is acknowledged that any roof to the proposed extension should not be a replication of the thatch to the existing dwelling house. However, the proposed roof design is considered to be an unsympathetic feature to the dwelling detrimentally impacting its appearance. It is also apparent that the ridge height has not been informed by an assessment of what the visual impact would be on the listed building. The proposed roof, in considering its ridge height, would interrupt an important view of the buildings historic features. This is unacceptable as the proposed roof would not enhance, sustain, or converse the listed building.
8.8 The proposed extension greatly impacts views of the rear of the dwelling due to its positioning. When compared to the previously refused schemes, the proposal has been shifted north with a marginal decrease in footprint. The 5.6 metre span for the extension has resulted in it becoming a dominant feature to the rear elevation.
8.9 The existing dwelling features a strong rectangular plan form. As shown on the proposed north elevation, the rear extension goes beyond the existing building line of the $18^{\text {th }}$ century two storey extension. Therefore, this is considered to have a detrimental impact on the regular, rectangular plan form which would not compliment the character and appearance of the building.
8.10 The proposed development, due to its roof design and attachment to the existing lean-to creates an unsympathetic and unusual juxtaposition creating the appearance of linking an outbuilding to the listed building, rather than a sympathetically designed extension which does not detract from the dominance of the existing dwelling house.
8.11 The proposal is considered to be harmful to the significance of the Listed Building. The proposed design does not compliment, integrate or respect the listed building. As such, the proposed is considered to be of poor design and would not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage asset. While the proposed materials are traditional per se, the design of a hipped roof and clay tile are not methods which conserve the listed building. The existing lean-to demonstrates the traditional method of extending a historic building such as this. Therefore, the attachment of a disjointed outbuilding to the existing lean-to would not integrate well with the existing building resulting in an adverse impact significantly harming the listed building. The harm created by the proposal is not outweighed by any public benefit due to remedial works can be carried out to the existing lean-to for damp issues, thermal efficiency to be improved, and parasite infestation. No loss of historic fabric would occur as the area affected is a relatively modern rear extension. The proposal does not comply with Policy E1 and E9 of the TVBRLP.

### 8.12 Impact on the Conservation Area

The proposal would only achieve glimpsed public views from the adjacent highway of The Village. Views of the ridge would be possible from Chalkpit Lane, however as this would also be a glimpsed view, on balance, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and therefore, its effect is to preserve this heritage asset. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy E9 of the TVBRLP for this aspect.

### 8.13 Impact on Biodiversity

The proposal is supported by a biodiversity checklist, however, no further survey work has been submitted to demonstrate the presence of any on-site protected species. Due to the works would not interfere with the thatched roof and the slate roof lean-to does not have a void or space under the slate tiles, it is considered unlikely that the proposal would adversely impact protected species. Therefore the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.
8.14 Impact to Amenity

The proposed extension is of a scale and siting within the plot which is considered to not adversely impact neighbouring property through a loss of daylight, sunlight, or overshadow. Furthermore, it does not reduce the private amenity space to below an acceptable level. Therefore the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 Under such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the NPPF and Policy E9 advises that the harm created by the proposed design, appearance and plan form should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings. The applicant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because it would enable an inclusive and accessible home with better thermal efficiency. However, the viable use of the property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence. The issues raised under the previously refused applications has not been addressed as the proposed plan form and roof design also adversely impacts the existing listed building due to the projection beyond the rear building line of the existing two storey extension and the dual pitch hipped roof.

### 10.0 RECOMMENDATION <br> REFUSE for the reason:

1. The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage asset (listed building) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 192, 193 and 196 also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

Note to applicant:

1. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to 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.
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## ITEM 12

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/02092/LBWS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 07.08.2018 |
| APPLICANT | Mr And Mrs M Parrott |
| SITE | 29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 |
|  | 1NF, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR |
| PROPOSAL | Single storey rear extension to provide an extended |
|  | kitchen |
| AMENDMENTS | None |
| CASE OFFICER | 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 interest.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The site is located within the settlement of West Tytherley. The Grade II listed building is a detached two storey property of timber frame and brick infill with thatched roof and white timber. Development has occurred to the rear of the property resulting in a two storey extension with thatched roof, and a single storey slate roof lean-to. Parking is situated to the rear. Boundary treatment to the front and side elevation is hedging of varying heights.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 Single storey rear extension to provide an extended kitchen joining onto the existing slate roof lean-to measuring 5.6 metres by 3.8 metres, with a ridge height of 3.8 metres and eaves of 2.2 metres. The applicant has confirmed in writing that the lean-to is slowly deteriorating showing signs of damp and has a parasite infestation.

### 4.0 HISTORY

4.1 18/01046/FULLS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C REFUSE 08.06.2018
Item was presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee on the $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ June 2018.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.2 18/01047/LBWS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C REFUSE 08.06.2018

Item was presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee on the $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ June 2018.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.3 Figure 1 below shows the proposed plan for the previously refused scheme 18/01046/FULLS and the associated listed building consent application 18/01047/LBWS.


Figure 1: Previously refused scheme under applications 18/01046/FULLS and 18/01047/LBWS.
4.4 18/00294/FULLS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C REFUSED 29.01.2018
Decision was issued under Delegated Authority.
Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.5 18/00295/LBWS Single storey rear extension to provide Kitchen and W/C and removal of existing external wall of 'lean to' REFUSED 29.01.2018
Decision was issued under Delegated Authority.

Reason for refusal: The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage assets (listed building and conservation area) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 131, 132 and 134, also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
4.6 Figure 2 below shows the proposed plan for the previously refused scheme 18/00294/FULLS and the associated listed building consent application 18/00295/LBWS.


Figure 2: Previously refused scheme under application 18/00294/FULLS and 18/00295/LBWS.

### 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Conservation: Objection:

The cottage is timber framed and thatched and dates from the C17. At the rear is a small brick wing of the C18, also thatched. At the rear of the timber framed part is a slate-roofed brick lean-to, described as approximately 50 years old. The latter may have replaced a similar earlier lean-to structure as the footprint of the cottage as shown on late C19 OS maps is similar to the present one. This is a traditional means of extending vernacular buildings.

As a listed building the cottage is a designated heritage assets as is the conservation area in which it is situated.

The proposal is to add a single-storey kitchen extension to the rear, attaching it to the existing single-storey lean-to. In itself it would be of traditional form and materials, of painted brick and with a hipped tile roof. However, as a form of extension to such a cottage it would not represent a traditional approach, and in this case would be harmful to the significance of the listed cottage as a heritage asset.

The existing lean-to addition is a traditional method of extending vernacular buildings of this type. The proposals retain this but the addition would be positioned in front of it, largely negating its visual contribution to the building's character. The proposed extension would not be integrated well with the existing building and, indeed, would have the appearance of a free-standing building which happens to be attached to the cottage.

It is considered that it will not be possible to achieve an extension providing the accommodation required by the applicants in this location without resulting in harm to the significance of the heritage assets. There would be no public benefits sufficient to offset this harm.
5.2 Ecology: No concerns - subject to note.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 13.09.2018
6.1 Parish Council: No comment.

## $6.25 \times$ letters of support (summarised):

- No visual impact on any neighbouring properties or the road.
- Current kitchen not suitable as cold and damp.
- Improving the listed cottage will ensure its survival.
- Opposite application site is a modern utilitarian residential social housing block and village shop.
- The proposal has no real impact on our local landscape.
- Proposal represents a significant improvement to the essential amenities of the cottage.
- Support the application as a sensible compromise between the quality demands of sustainable modern family life and the aesthetic demands of the local development plan.
- Wholly appropriate improvement to a building which is in essential need of improvement to its basic facilities.
- Proposed upgrade is absolutely essential to create a viable living space and modern family home, whilst maintaining the listed property as an asset to the village and the local community.
- Crucial for houses this age to be updated to meet the needs of family life.
- Without updating there is a real danger that these houses will fall into disrepair, as they will not be suitable for modern family living.
- Without us looking after these character properties village characteristics are in danger of being lost forever.
- The proposal will have minimal visual impact on the house from most aspects but will make it a much more viable family home.


### 7.0 POLICY

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

### 7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP) <br> Policy E5 - Biodiversity <br> Policy E9 - Heritage

### 7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) <br> West Tytherley - Conservation Area Policy

### 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Impact on the Conservation Area
- Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Listed Building
- Impact on biodiversity
8.2 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty on decision makers in considering whether to grant consent for works that affect a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural interest which it possess.
8.3 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a Listed Building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess. Considerable weight must therefore be given to the preservation of the listed building, including its setting.
8.4 The House of Lords in South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment case decided that the "statutorily desirable object of preserving the character or appearance of an area is achieved either by a positive contribution to preservation or by development which leaves character of appearance unharmed, that is to say preserved.


### 8.5 Impact on the Conservation Area

The proposal would only achieve glimpsed public views from the adjacent highway of The Village. Views of the ridge would be possible from Chalkpit Lane, however as this would also be a glimpsed view, on balance, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy E9 of the TVBRLP for this aspect.

### 8.6 Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Listed Building

The character and appearance of the area is traditional in the use of materials and building style. The neighbouring properties of Nutshall Cottage, The Dove House, Collarmakers, and Village Farm are examples of this whereby the use of timber frame with white brick infill is prominent with roof types of thatch and clay tile. The current proposal features brick painted white with reclaimed red/brown clay tiles. The white painted brick will match the existing dwelling house, while the red/brown tile is a material not used on the existing thatched dwelling house but is present on the outbuilding to the rear.
8.7 The proposed roof design is considered to adversely impact the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house. It is acknowledged that any roof to the proposed extension should not be a replication of the thatch to the existing dwelling house. However, the proposed roof design is considered to be an unsympathetic feature to the dwelling detrimentally impacting its appearance. It is also apparent that the ridge height has not been informed by an assessment of what the visual impact would be on the listed building. The proposed roof, in considering its ridge height, would interrupt an important view of the buildings historic features. This is unacceptable as the proposed roof would not enhance, sustain, or converse the listed building.
8.8 The proposed extension greatly impacts views of the rear of the dwelling due to its positioning. When compared to the previously refused schemes, the proposal has been shifted north with a marginal decrease in footprint. The 5.6 metre span for the extension has resulted in it becoming a dominant feature to the rear elevation.
8.9 The existing dwelling features a strong rectangular plan form. As shown on the proposed north elevation, the rear extension goes beyond the existing building line of the $18^{\text {th }}$ century two storey extension. Therefore, this is considered to have a detrimental impact on the regular, rectangular plan form which would not compliment the character and appearance of the building.
8.10 The proposed development, due to its roof design and attachment to the existing lean-to creates an unsympathetic and unusual juxtaposition creating the appearance of linking an outbuilding to the listed building, rather than a sympathetically designed extension which does not detract from the dominance of the existing dwelling house.
8.11 The proposal is considered to be harmful to the significance of the Listed Building. The proposed design does not compliment, integrate or respect the listed building. As such, the proposed is considered to be of poor design and would not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage asset. While the proposed materials are traditional per se, the design of a hipped roof and clay tile are not methods which conserve the listed building. The existing lean-to demonstrates the traditional method of extending a historic building such as this. Therefore, the attachment of a disjointed outbuilding to the existing lean-to would not integrate well with the existing building resulting in an adverse impact significantly harming the listed building. The harm created by the proposal is not outweighed by any public benefit due to remedial works can be carried out to the existing lean-to for damp issues, thermal efficiency to be improved, and parasite infestation. No loss of historic fabric would occur as the area affected is a relatively modern rear extension. The proposal does not comply with Policy E1 and E9 of the TVBRLP.
9.0 CONCLUSION
9.1 Under such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the NPPF and Policy E9 advises that the harm created by the proposed design, appearance and plan form should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes
the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings. The applicant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because it would enable an inclusive and accessible home with better thermal efficiency. However, the viable use of the property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence. The issues raised under the previously refused applications has not been addressed as the proposed plan form and roof design also adversely impacts the existing listed building due to the projection beyond the rear building line of the existing two storey extension and the dual pitch hipped roof.

### 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the reason:

1. The proposed extension will not make a positive contribution to sustaining the significance of the designated heritage asset (listed building) affected, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 192, 193 and 196 also Policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
Note to applicant:
2. 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.
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## ITEM 13

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/02173/LBWS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | LISTED BUILDING WORKS - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 15.08.2018 |
| APPLICANT | Cllr Daniel Busk |
| SITE | Houghton Lodge, Houghton Road, North Houghton, |
|  | SO20 6LQ, HOUGHTON |
| PROPOSAL | Reinstatement of arch, replace concrete paving and |
|  | replace fire surround |
| AMENDMENTS | None |
| CASE OFFICER | Mr Nathan Glasgow |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)
1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.1 This application is presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee as there is a Member Interest in the application site.
2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION
2.1 Houghton Lodge is a Grade II* listed building and also falls within the Houghton and Bossington Conservation Area.
3.0 PROPOSAL
3.1 Reinstatement of internal archway, replacement of external concrete pavingand replacement of fire surround.
4.0 HISTORY
4.1 TVS.LB. 00289 - Alterations, extension and demolition of lean-to bin store and larder - Consent 25.03.1987.
5.0 CONSULTATIONS
5.1 Conservation - No objection subject to conditions.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 14.09.2018
6.1 Houghton Parish Council - Support.
7.0 POLICY
7.1 Government GuidanceNational Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)
E9: Heritage

### 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The impact of the proposal on the historic interest, setting and fabric of the listed building, and
- The impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area


### 8.2 Reinstatement of archway

The proposed archway was previously blocked up in the mid-late $20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{C}$, with evidence provided within the application of historical photos showing the previous layout of the area involved. The current arrangement is not considered to contain any historical importance and there would be no loss of historic fabric from removing the modern stud wall. Therefore, it is considered the reinstatement of the arch would represent an enhancement to appreciating the original plan form of the house.
8.3 Replacement fire surround

The existing fire surround is modern and is not considered to hold any historical importance. The styling and appearance of the fireplace is considered to have a detrimental affect to the listed building and its replacement is wholly supported. A condition has been recommended to provide details of the proposed fire surround to ensure the detailing and appearance maintain the architectural importance of the listed building.
8.4 The proposed internal works comprising the reinstatement of the archway and the replacement fire surround are considered to preserve the historic setting, character and fabric of the listed building and the proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy E9 of the TVBRLP.

### 8.5 Replacement stone paving

The paving which surrounds Houghton Lodge around the southern areas is currently made up of concrete paving. The paving has, over time, faded and accumulated dirt and gaps which have a detrimental impact to the appearance of the listed building. Replacing these and laying an area down in the northeast area of Houghton Lodge, with York stone is considered an improvement to the appearance of the listed building. A condition has been recommended to provide proposed details and finishes of the York stone to protect the architectural interest of the building.
8.6 With the location of Houghton Lodge being set back approximately 115m from the public highway, and the nature and location of the proposed works, there are no public views afforded to the proposed works. Therefore it is considered there would be a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Policy E9 of the TVBRLP

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal does not provide any harm to the listed building or the Conservation Area and is in accordance with Policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and is therefore acceptable.

### 10.0 RECOMMENDATION <br> CONSENT subject to:

1. The works hereby consented to shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. The works hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plan numbers:
Location Plan
Site Plan
Existing Floor Plan
Proposed Floor Plan
Archway Elevation
Fireplace Elevation
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. No works shall take place to the external paving area until samples and details of the York stone to be used in the construction of the replacement external paving have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include sizes, finishes and the means of laying the replacement stones. Works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure the detailing and materials maintain the architectural interest of the building in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E9.
4. Full details, including scaled drawings and the proposed final appearance of the replacement fireplace, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works to the fireplace. Work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the detailing and materials maintain the architectural interest of the building in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E9.
5. Upon the removal of the existing stud wall section and the historic archway being revealed, and prior to any undertaking of work to the new archway, full details of:

- dimensions of both the historic archway and the new archway, including annotated photographs,
- the materials to be used in the construction of the new archway, and
- the means of attachment of the archway
shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The new archway shall match as closely as possible to the existing adjacent archway to the hallway, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure adequate safeguards are in place to protect the structure and the works are of a standard appropriate to a listed building in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E9.

Note 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.
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## ITEM 14

| APPLICATION NO. | 18/02267/FULLS |
| :--- | :--- |
| APPLICATION TYPE | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH |
| REGISTERED | 30.08 .2018 |
| APPLICANT | Mark and Jess Weeks and Yorke |
| SITE | 14 Fairview Close, Romsey, SO51 7LS, ROMSEY |
|  | TOWN (CUPERNHAM) |
| PROPOSAL | Erection of front and rear single storey extensions to |
|  | form extended lounge/dining area and porch |
| AMENDMENTS | None |
| CASE OFFICER | Mrs Sacha Coen |

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee in accordance with the Member and Officer Interests Protocol.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 This is an end of terrace two-storey property within the settlement area of Romsey. This row of terraced properties fronts an area of open space.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 Erection of front and rear single storey extensions to form extended lounge/dining area and porch.

### 4.0 HISTORY

4.1 None.
5.0 CONSULTATIONS
5.1 Ecology: No concern subject to note.
5.2 Trees: No objection.
6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 25.09.2018
6.1 Romsey Town Council: No response at the time of writing the report

### 7.0 POLICY

$\begin{aligned} \text { 7.1 } & \text { Government Guidance } \\ & \text { National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) } \\ & \text { National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) }\end{aligned}$
7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)

Policy SD1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy COM2 - Settlement Hierarchy

Policy E1- High Quality Development in the Borough
Policy E2 - Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough
Policy E5 - Biodiversity
Policy LHW4 - Amenity
Policy T2 - Parking Standards

### 7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) <br> Village Design Statement <br> "Look at Romsey - Area 5 Great Woodley": Romsey Town Design Guidance <br> Supplementary Planning Document (January 2008)

### 8.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Impact on amenity of neighbouring property
- Impact on ecology
- Impact on parking provision


### 8.2 Principle of development

The sites lies within the settlement boundary as defined on the Inset Maps of the TVBRLP. In accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP development is permitted provided the proposal is appropriate to other policies of the Revised Local Plan. The proposal is assessed against relevant policies below.

### 8.3 Impact on the character and appearance of the area <br> Front Extension

The development is located in a position such that public views would be possible from the existing open space in front of the property. Although the proposal will be visible from the open space, like other front extensions within Fairview Drive and Fairview Close, the modest size and single storey nature of these extensions do not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the area. The proposed front extension reflects many others found at neighbouring properties and additionally some have also changed their existing flat roofed protrusion to pitch. It is noted that the immediate neighbours to the application site have chosen to remain with flat roofs; however this somewhat mixed design does not detract from the character and appearance of the area. The extension will make use of matching materials as to be in keeping with the existing dwelling and as such, the extension integrates and compliments the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area, in compliance with Policies COM2 and E1 of the TVBRLP.

### 8.4 Rear Porch <br> The proposed porch is modest in size and similar to the existing porches found on neighbouring properties number 11 and 13. By the use of matching materials the porch will integrate and compliment the existing dwelling and as such, the porch is will not detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in compliance with Policies COM2 and E1 of the TVBRLP.

### 8.5 Impact on amenity of neighbouring property

By virtue of the size (bulk and mass) and design of the proposals, the position relative to the adjacent neighbouring property number 13, the nature of the neighbours front extension and the intervening boundary treatment to the rear of the property, the proposals would not give rise to an adverse impact on the living conditions of the adjacent neighbour by virtue of loss of daylight, sun light, or privacy. The proposal is in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

### 8.6 Impact on ecology

The front and rear of the host property support hanging tiles which can be a haven for bat roosts. As the development will partially impacts these hanging tiles the Ecology Officer was consulted. The Ecology Officer has raised no concern given the condition of the property and its closely fitted tile hangings. However given the application site is adjacent to a wooded corridor an informative note has been attached to this decision to stop works if bats or any evidence of bats are encountered. The application therefore complies with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.
8.7 Trees

The proposal is not considered to give rise to any adverse impacts on existing trees or their root protection zones, in accordance with Policy E2 of the TVBRLP.

### 8.8 Impact on parking provision

The proposal does not give rise to an additional demand for car parking or result in the loss of existing car parking spaces to serve the dwelling, in accordance with the parking standards as set out in Annex G and Policy T2 of the TVBRLP.

### 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposal is considered acceptable and in accordance with the policies of the TVBRLP.

### 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 plans.
Site Location Plan
Block Plan
Existing Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 001 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 002A
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. The external materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match in type, colour and texture those used in the existing building.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship of the new development with the existing in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.
Notes to applicant:
4. 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.
5. 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 2010 (as amended). 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.




[^0]:    * The applicant may choose to withdraw the application. No further action would be taken on that proposal and the file is closed.
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