

7. **16/00922/FULLN (REFUSE) 25.04.2016** **10 – 69**
SITE: 64-70 Adelaide Road, Andover, **ANDOVER TOWN**
(ST MARYS)

CASE OFFICER: Laura McKay

8. **16/00938/RDCAN (REFUSE) 25.04.2016** **70 – 88**
SITE: 64-70 Adelaide Road, Andover, **ANDOVER TOWN**
(ST MARYS)

CASE OFFICER: Laura McKay

APPLICATION NO.	16/00922/FULLN
SITE	64-70 Adelaide Road, Andover, Hampshire, SP10 1HG, ANDOVER TOWN (ST MARYS)
COMMITTEE DATE	15 th November 2018
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	10 - 69

1.0 VIEWING PANEL

1.1 A Viewing Panel was conducted on the 14th November 2018, commencing at 9am. It was attended by Cllr Andersen, Cllr Borg-Neal, Cllr Brooks, Cllr Budzynski, Cllr Cockaday, Cllr Hawke, Cllr Lynn, Cllr North and Cllr Preston. Apologies were received from Cllr Flood and Cllr Denny.

2.0 CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 Ecology – no objection (summarised)

The survey is a bit old but given where the site is (middle of Andover, surrounded by busy roads and a fair bit of street lighting) I very much doubt that bats would have started to use the building in the last couple of years. The bat boxes were not needed to compensate for any impacts, and were more of an enhancement, based on the applicant's ecologist's recommendation.

3.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Comparison between existing and proposed buildings

A query was raised at the Viewing Panel regarding the size of the proposed building compared to the size of the existing building. The applicants were asked if they could assist in clarifying this and in response have provided a drawing showing the existing building overlaid onto the proposed building. The drawing is attached to this Update Paper.

The dimensions of the existing and proposed buildings are set out in the table below:

Dimensions	Existing building	Proposed building
Height	7.5m at western end, 8m at eastern end (taking into account the slope of the land)	3.4m at western end; 9.8m in the middle section (3 storey); 7.2m at eastern end
Width	22.1m	55.4m (end to end)
Depth	min. 3.9m, max. 6.1m	min. 5.8m, max. 10m

3.2 Ecology

Further to paragraphs 8.118 and 8.119 of the main Agenda Report, the County Ecologist has now confirmed that although relatively old, the Ecology report submitted with the application is acceptable and that it is unlikely that the building is used by bats. Therefore the third reason for refusal in the main Agenda Report is no longer necessary.


4.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The proposal demolition of the Acre Almshouses would result in substantial harm to the significance of that non-designated heritage asset and less than substantial harm to the significance of the Andover conservation area. The proposed replacement building, due to its scale, bulk, layout and design, would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area by eroding the historic Town/Common Acre and the relationship of the almshouses with buildings and spaces to the south of the application site, features which make an important contribution to defining the significance of this part of the conservation area. As such it fails to improve the character, function and quality of the area. Having regard to planning law and the National Planning Policy Framework, great weight must be given to the conservation of heritage assets which are an irreplaceable resource. The design of the scheme has not been informed by the significance of heritage assets, is not sympathetic to local character or history and there is no clear and convincing justification for the harm identified. The proposal would result in significant public benefits through the provision of 8 additional affordable housing units however the public benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harm identified to heritage assets in this case. The proposal is contrary to policies E1 and E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and the provisions of Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no other material considerations that would justify granting permission contrary to the development plan.**
2. **The proposal would result in the loss of all public car parking with no mechanism to secure any public access to the proposed spaces or across the site. This would discourage people from walking in this area; would have an adverse economic impact on the adjacent convenience store due to the loss of free parking adjacent to it, and impact on the residents who do not have alternative parking. It would result in displacement of cars onto surrounding roads and it has not been demonstrated that this would not result in adverse impacts on highway safety. As such the proposal is contrary to policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and the provisions of paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

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.**




EAST ST VIEW

U.R. CHURCH

THE MANSE


No. 48



ADELAIDE RD VIEW

SHOP

SHOPS + FLATS



ROUNDBOULT VIEW

U.R. CHURCH BEHIND

THE MANSE

ACRE ALMHOUSES
ANDOVER

STREET VIEWS

1:200 FEB'10

3271/400

APPLICATION NO.	16/00938/RDCAN
SITE	64-70 Adelaide Road, Andover, Hampshire, SP10 1HG, ANDOVER TOWN (ST MARYS)
COMMITTEE DATE	15 th November 2018
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	70 - 88

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

- 1.1 A Viewing Panel was conducted on the 14th November 2018, commencing at 9am. It was attended by Cllr Andersen, Cllr Borg-Neal, Cllr Brooks, Cllr Budzynski, Cllr Cockaday, Cllr Hawke, Cllr Lynn, Cllr North and Cllr Preston. Apologies were received from Cllr Flood and Cllr Denny.

2.0 **CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS**

2.1 **Ecology – no objection (summarised)**

The survey is a bit old but given where the site is (middle of Andover, surrounded by busy roads and a fair bit of street lighting) I very much doubt that bats would have started to use the building in the last couple of years. The bat boxes were not needed to compensate for any impacts, and were more of an enhancement, based on the applicant's ecologist's recommendation.

3.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 **Ecology**

Further to paragraphs 8.118 and 8.119 of the main Agenda Report, the County Ecologist has now confirmed that although relatively old, the Ecology report submitted with the application is acceptable and that it is unlikely that the building is used by bats. Therefore the second reason for refusal in the main Agenda Report is no longer necessary.

4.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. **The proposed demolition of the building would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of Andover conservation area. The proposed redevelopment scheme would in itself harm the significance of the conservation area and the public benefits of the redevelopment scheme would not outweigh the harm identified. As such the harm resulting from the demolition of the existing building would not be outweighed by the benefits of the replacement development and is contrary to policy E9 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and the provisions of Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no other material considerations identified that would outweigh the conflict with the development plan.**

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.