

7. **18/01560/FULLS (PERMISSION) 03.07.2018** 11 – 34
SITE: The Four Horseshoes, Nursling Street, Nursling,
NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS

CASE OFFICER: Sarah Barter
8. **18/01953/FULLS (PERMISSION) 24.07.2018** 35 – 58
SITE: Land Adjacent to Meadow View, Houghton,
Stockbridge, **HOUGHTON**

CASE OFFICER: Astrid Lynn
9. **18/02170/FULLS (REFUSE) 14.08.2018** 59 – 80
SITE: Bracken Wood, Jermyns Lane, Ampfield,
ROMSEY EXTRA

CASE OFFICER: Sarah Barter
10. **18/01811/FULLS (PERMISSION) 16.07.2018** 81 - 89
SITE: 9 Partry Close, Chandlers Ford,
VALLEY PARK

CASE OFFICER: Nathan Glasgow
11. **18/02090/FULLS (REFUSE) 07.08.2018** 90 – 101
SITE: 29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley,
Salisbury, **WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR**

CASE OFFICER: Jacob Cooke
12. **18/02092/LBWS (REFUSE) 07.08.2018** 102 - 112
SITE: 29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley,
Salisbury, **WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR**

CASE OFFICER: Jacob Cooke

APPLICATION NO.	18/01560/FULLS
SITE	The Four Horseshoes , Nursling Street, Nursling, SO16 0YA, NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS
COMMITTEE DATE	9 th October 2018
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	11 - 34

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 A viewing panel was held on Friday 5th October 2018 at 2pm.

Attendees:

Cllr Finlay, Cllr Bundy, Cllr Anderdon, Cllr C Dowden, Cllr A Dowden, Cllr Cooper, Cllr Hurst, Councillor Thom, Cllr Tupper.

1.2 Apologies:

Cllr Richards, Cllr Hibberd, Cllr Baverstock, Cllr Ward, Cllr Bailey, Cllr Adams King, Cllr Boulton.

2.0 **REPRESENTATIONS**

2.1 29 notes from various addresses – **Support.**

Question: Would you like to see The Four Horseshoes re-open with the aid of the 5 new houses to the rear?

Answer ticked: Yes.

2.2 Unknown address – **Objection:**

- The continued and persistent linking of the re-opening of the public house to the granting of planning permission gives the impression that one can't happen without the other. I do not believe this to be necessarily true.
- Considering the ownership being from the property development sector it does beg the question; has the development of houses on the site been the intention all along? After all, a similar operation was carried out by building houses at the rear of the Saints pub following a purchase in 2009.
- With the pub on a large plot of land on either side of Nursling St, it does seem that the developer owners will next seek planning permission on the field opposite the pub next, possibly in guise of the same stalking horse context that it needs to be granted in order to fund the re-opening of the pub. There are already rumours and talk within the local community that investigation and surveys in regards to the viability of building on the field adjacent has been carried out even due to the fact there is covenant on the land.
- The dead end of Nursling Street has deteriorated and become an eye soar since the closure of the pub. I find this no accident but rather a managed decline in order to persuade planners that new development will bring regeneration with it.
- My real concern however is in regards to the people within the area and those that live on Nursling St or in Nursling itself are having their voices drowned out from people from other areas.
- One social media post is a photo of supposed 'locals' standing outside

the pub with a save our pub banner. There was no doubt to me, having recognised some of these people that these were not locals to Nursling or the Four Horseshoes as such but locals and regulars to the Saints pub.

3.0 COMMENTS ON OBJECTION

- 3.1 The application site is located within the settlement boundary of this part of Nursling. As such the recommendation does not rely on the erection of dwellings or the extension of the public house to make the other part of the development acceptable in planning terms.
The future intentions of the land owners are not a material planning consideration.

4.0 VIABILITY ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 A Viability Assessment was submitted with the application. Given the application sites location within settlement boundary as set out within the Test Valley Revised Borough Local Plan 2016 the scheme does not rely on the building of the dwellings to ensure that the public houses refurbishment and extension is acceptable in planning terms.

5.0 AIR QUALITY ASSESMENT

- 5.1 The submitted report has three objectives:
- Assess the potential impact of air pollution emission and nuisance dust generation during the construction phase of the project (construction phase).
 - Screen the potential impact of additional air pollution arising from new trip generation following completion of the development (operational phase).
 - Assess the suitability of the site for residential purposes given the sites proximity to the motorway system.

The report concludes as follows:

1. Emissions from construction traffic are not likely to be significant in terms of impact upon human health. The significance of potential nuisance dust emission from constructional activity is assessed using the conventional Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) Guidance and considered to be low risk. A range of generic good practice mitigation is recommended in Appendix D. This conclusion is accepted.
2. Operational impacts are screened out as of low significance using IAQM criteria due to the expected low number of new road trips likely to be generated. This conclusion is accepted.
3. The suitability of the site is assessed using a dispersion model to predict conditions in 2019 arising from traffic utilising the motorway network. The model uses input data including three years of meteorological data and traffic data published by the Highways Agency for the motorways, to predict whether national health based annual average objectives for nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter would likely be exceeded at the footprints of the proposed new dwellings. Nationally accepted empirical relationships are also used to screen whether there is a risk that short term objectives might be exceeded on this site. The report concludes that concentrations of these pollutants would likely be below national air quality objectives for air pollutants established to protect human health. The conclusion is accepted.

Overall the Environmental Health Officer is satisfied that it is unlikely that air pollution generated by the development would cause adverse impacts provided the reasonable precautions outlined in the report are taken during the construction phase. The Environmental Health Officer is also satisfied that air quality on this site would be unlikely to exceed nationally set criteria established to protect human health.

6.0 NOISE READINGS

6.1 In response to a question raised as to whether the submitted acoustic report may have under-represented noise levels on this site, a short noise measurement (taken over a 15 minute period starting 10:45 hrs) was taken in a representative position by a TVBC Environmental Health Officer on 3rd October 2018, in order to see if there appeared to be any evidence of possible under-representation of sound levels as stated in the Venta Acoustics noise survey report, reference VA2069.180815.NIA2.1, submitted in support of the application. The noise level measured on 3rd October was actually lower than the equivalent noise level reported in the Venta Acoustics report and the Environmental Protection Team advise that they consider there to be no reason to dispute the noise measurements contained within that report.

7.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

PERMISSION subject to conditions 1 – 4, 6 – 16, and 18 and notes 1 – 4 of the agenda report recommendation and updated conditions 5 and 17 and additional condition 19 as follows:

5. **Prior to the commencement of development the access shall be constructed with the visibility splays of 2m x 253m and maintained as such at all times. Within these visibility splays notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no obstacles, including walls, fences and vegetation, shall exceed the height of 1m 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.
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.
19. **Development shall proceed in accordance with the measures to secure mitigation for the low risk and medium risks effects of construction dust set out within the Eden Green Environmental Air Quality Assessment dated 5.10.2018 appendix D.**
Reason: To ensure the impact of construction dust is managed in accordance with policy E8 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

APPLICATION NO.	18/01953/FULLS
SITE	Land Adjacent To Meadow View , Houghton, Stockbridge, SO20 6LT, HOUGHTON
COMMITTEE DATE	9 th October 2018
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	35 - 58

1.0 CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 Houghton Parish Council. Objection (Summarised):

- The copse is part of an ambitious five year programme of work by the British Trust for ornithology – to improve knowledge & understanding of breeding owl species.
- Owls are thought to breed here.
- The village Rookery is on site too.
- Migrant birds, many on the red list, are observed in the copse. The River Test is ideal as one of the green corridors for migrating birds, with its small sheltered woods and copses.
- Houghton is a small conservation village which has lost 3 vital habitats in recent years, and seen unprecedented development over the last two years, with 13 houses built within the next year, 6 already in Kents Orchard, potential replacement of Dianthus, works to South End Cottage and Houghton Farmhouse with a disastrous effect on bio diversity.
- This is its last remaining copse. Its native trees and bushes make it an excellent bio-diverse habitat, with an understorey perfect for foraging ground feeding birds, animals and insects which must be preserved as part of the 'bigger conservation picture'.
- The whole wood tree preservation order is of huge benefit to conservation and biodiversity in Houghton and beyond.
- The village requests this is retained in perpetuity.
- The proposal almost certainly contravenes the Conservation of habitats and Species Regs, 2010.
- The ecologists report failed to take this cumulative impact into account, as did the HCC Ecologists response.
- Loss of biodiversity recently included the mistaken removal of an ancient hedgerow. Trees were lost at the Kents Orchard development.
- There is no current proposal for a garage or outbuildings which would further impact on the biodiversity of the copse.
- The Parish Council has never seen so many objections to an application, which indicates how important the copse is to the village.

1.2 Tree Officer – No objection (Summarised)

Satisfied that the Arboricultural Reports Barrell Tree Care Report address the arboricultural aspects of this case as thoroughly as can be.

Please seek removal of PD rights and ensure that an informative is attached to any consent.

2.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 2.1 The Parish Council's additional response is clear. The HCC Ecologist has however, clearly stated that the submitted Ecology Report contained all Survey information required, including a mitigation section, to mitigate the impact of the development on ecological interests. These are included in the proposed conditions.
- 2.2 Conditions have been recommended that secure the planting and future management of the woodland, which has hitherto been absent.
- 2.3 The representation made does not therefore alter the officer's recommendation.
- 2.4 With reference to the Tree Officer additional response, paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework states Planning conditions should only be imposed where they are:
1. necessary;
 2. relevant to planning and;
 3. to the development to be permitted;
 4. enforceable;
 5. precise and;
 6. reasonable in all other respects.

In this circumstance the blanket removal of permitted development rights would not be necessary and would be considered unreasonable as the removal of any tree within the site would require the formal consent of the Council. To undertake works to a preserved tree without first obtaining consent can result in criminal prosecution. Secondly, no evidence has been advanced to demonstrate that works which would constitute permitted development would result in harm to any protected trees. As such, it is the view of officers that such a condition should not be added to the decision should permission be granted.

2.5 Point of clarification.

Pages 57-58 comprise Appendix A, the plans and elevations for the refused scheme 17/02017/FULLS.

3.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes as per agenda report recommendation and additional Note no. 4.

Notes 1-3 and note 4.

4. The various trees standing within this site are all protected by virtue of standing within the Houghton Conservation Area and also by Tree Preservation Order (TPO.TVBC.1124) Damage to any of the trees not identified for removal on the approved plans is an offence. Failure to comply in full with Barrell Tree Consultancy Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement 17347-AA2-PB is likely to result in damage to the trees. Damage to the trees may lead to the prosecution of those undertaking the work and also of those instructing, causing or permitting the works.

APPLICATION NO.	18/02170/FULLS
SITE	Bracken Wood, Jermyns Lane, Ampfield, SO51 0QA, ROMSEY EXTRA AMPFIELD
COMMITTEE DATE	9 th October 2018
ITEM NO.	9
PAGE NO.	59 - 80

1.0 REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 Ampfield PC – Objection:

A query was raised regarding the timing of this response and whether or not this response had been considered in full by the Ampfield PC planning committee. An email received today from the Parish Council Chairman confirms that the Ampfield PC met on Monday 8th October 2018 and recorded an endorsement of the objection to this application as per the original response forwarded on the 17th September 2018.

1.2 Unknown address – Objection:

- The property is located within countryside as defined within the Borough Local Plan which does not permit development except in very specific circumstances. These exceptions do not apply to this particular application.
- I concur with Ampfield PCs response.

2.0 POLICY

2.1 Supplementary Planning Document

A query has been raised with regards the inclusion of the Ampfield VDS in the agenda report. The Parish Council response from Ampfield included reference to this VDS and as such it is considered reasonable to include this document for reference.

3.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 New Forest SPA

Payment for the New Forest SPA was secured on the 26th September 2018 as such the second reason for refusal has been removed from the recommendation.

4.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for reason 1 of the agenda report only.

APPLICATION NO.	18/01811/FULLS
SITE	9 Partry Close, Chandlers Ford, SO53 4SS, SO53 4SS, VALLEY PARK
COMMITTEE DATE	9 th October 2018
ITEM NO.	10
PAGE NO.	81 - 89

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 Attendees

Cllr Anderdon, Cllr Bundy, Cllr Cooper, Cllr A Dowden, Cllr C Dowden, Cllr Finlay, Cllr Hatley, Cllr Hurst, Cllr Thom.

1.2 Apologies

Cllr Adams-King, Cllr Baverstock, Cllr Boulton, Cllr Hibberd, Cllr Richards, Cllr Ward.

2.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

2.1 Further measurements have been taken of the curtilage of the application site, confirming that the proposed extension would cover 18% of the rear garden area, not including the existing dwelling or front garden/driveway. When including the existing house footprint with the proposed extension, the footprint would rise to 33% of the entire curtilage of the property.

3.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

Unchanged.

APPLICATION NO.	18/02090/FULLS
SITE	29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 1NF, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
COMMITTEE DATE	9 th October 2018
ITEM NO.	11
PAGE NO.	90 - 101

1.0 REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 1 x additional representation from *West Tytherley & Frenchmoor Parish Council*:

Planning applications 18/02090/FULLS and 18/02092/LBWS (29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury) are to be discussed at the Southern Area Planning Committee this evening @ 5:30pm.

WT&F PC are writing to confirm that the statement of 'No Comment' in relation to our determination of the above applications is invalid (as per the papers for consideration at the Southern Area Planning Committee Meeting). We have supported applications for this development and would therefore request the comment is updated to reflect this.

The clerk confirmed today by telephone that the Parish Council support the application.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

Unchanged.

APPLICATION NO.	18/02092/LBWS
SITE	29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 1NF, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
COMMITTEE DATE	9 th October 2018
ITEM NO.	12
PAGE NO.	102 - 112

1.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 1.1 1 x additional representation from *West Tytherley & Frenchmoor Parish Council*:

Planning applications 18/02090/FULLS and 18/02092/LBWS (29 Jessam Cottage, West Tytherley, Salisbury) are to be discussed at the Southern Area Planning Committee this evening @ 5:30pm.

WT&F PC are writing to confirm that the statement of 'No Comment' in relation to our determination of the above applications is invalid (as per the papers for consideration at the Southern Area Planning Committee Meeting). We have supported applications for this development and would therefore request the comment is updated to reflect this.

The clerk confirmed today by telephone that the Parish Council support this application.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION

Unchanged.