

UPDATE PAPER

Southern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 25th August 2020

Time: 5.30 p.m.

Venue: Being held virtually by Microsoft Teams. The Public can listen to the live stream here: <http://www.audiominutes.com/p/player/player.html?userid=tvbc>

Southern Area Planning Committee – 25 August 2020 Update Paper

The purpose of the report is to provide information on planning applications which has been received since the agenda was printed.

Report of Head of Planning

1. Background

- 1.1 Reports on planning applications are prepared for printing on the agenda some 10 days before the date of the Committee meeting but information and representations received after that time are relevant to the decision. This paper contains such information which was received before 10.00am on the date of the meeting. Any information received after that time is reported verbally.

2. Issues

- 2.1 Information and representations are summarized but the full text is available on the relevant file should Members require more details. The paper may contain an officer comment on the additional information, amended recommendations and amended and/or additional conditions.

7. **20/00701/FULLS (PERMISSION) 16.04.2020** **11 – 36**
SITE: The Abbey Hotel, 11 Church Street, Romsey
ROMSEY TOWN

CASE OFFICER: Paul Goodman
8. **20/01121/FULLS (PERMISSION) 29.05.2020** **37 – 55**
SITE: Land at Redbridge Lane, Redbridge Lane,
Nursling, **NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS**

CASE OFFICER: Mark Staincliffe
9. **19/01563/FULLS (PERMISSION) 20.06.2019** **56 – 78**
SITE: Oak Rest Home, Kents Oak, **AWBRIDGE**

CASE OFFICER: Sarah Barter

APPLICATION NO.	20/00701/FULLS
SITE	The Abbey Hotel , 11 Church Street, Romsey, SO51 8BT, ROMSEY TOWN
COMMITTEE DATE	25 th August 2020
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	11 - 36

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 An amended condition (3) is recommended following the submission of further noise survey work. An additional note is recommended in relation to the availability of on-street parking permits. Paragraph 8.15 of the Officers recommendation is amended to improve its clarity.

2.0 CONSULTATIONS

- 2.1 **Housing & Environmental Health (Environmental Protection)** – No objection, subject to condition.

3.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Noise

As is stated in para 8.25 of the recommendation, given the proximity of the proposed residential dwellings to neighbouring commercial uses, the Environmental Protection Officer required the submission of further noise survey work in accordance with the submitted noise impact assessment. That survey work has now been undertaken and the Environmental Protection Officer has raised no objection. The condition (3) has been amended to reflect the additional survey work but continues to require a further verification report to be submitted prior to occupation of the development. Subject to the required condition the proposed development is considered to adequately provide for the amenity of future occupiers in relation to noise and complies with Policy E8.

3.2 Parking

Further clarification has been sought regarding the prospect of residents securing on-street parking permits. The submission suggests that “There is every indication that no new development will be provided parking permits, nor provided with visitors parking permits.” HCC Highways have clarified that the traffic regulation order covering Romsey residential permit parking zone that contains the application site. The Order restricts parking permits as follows;

- 3.3 “The total number of Permits referred to in Articles 16 or 29 of this order which may be issued to all Residents of any property or properties constructed, converted or extended pursuant to planning permission granted after 3 March 2008 in respect of any particular site shall not exceed the total Permit entitlement of all Residents of the property or properties which occupied the same site at the time planning permission was granted”.

- 3.4 It is understood that this would mean that the site may benefit from a single permit entitlement from the managers flat but that no further permits would be allowed. The permit system is controlled by HCC Highways and the issue of permits or not cannot be conditioned as part of this application. However a note has been added advising the applicants of the likely lack of entitlement to parking permits for future occupiers.
- 3.5 Amendment to Para 8.15
Paragraph 8.15 of the agenda recommendation deals with the Conservation Officers concern that the application as originally submitted was not accompanied by an adequately detailed heritage statement. The Conservation Officer raised a further concern that the additional heritage assessment had been written after the proposals have been formulated and could not therefore have informed them. Whilst the criticism of the original submission is valid it is obviously not possible for the additional heritage statement, which followed on from the comments on the first statement, to have been prepared before the submission of the application.
- 3.6 In any event, as is stated in para 8.16, notwithstanding any deficiency in the originally submitted heritage information, and considering that the application site itself is not listed, the proposed works are clear from the application and it is considered that adequate information is available to assess the proposals impact on heritage assets.
- 4.0 **AMENDED CONDITION**
3. **Development shall be undertaken and mitigation installed in accordance with the Noise in accordance with the Noise Impact Assessment Ref VA3274.200527.NIA (Venta, May 2020) and Further Sound Survey (Venta, August 2020). However the dwellings shall not be occupied until a further sound testing undertaken, and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to confirm efficacy and achievement of the standards under Building Regulations and BS8233.**
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the future occupiers in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E8.
- 5.0 **ADDITIONAL NOTE**
3. **The applicant is advised that parking permits are restricted in this area under The Borough of Test Valley (Various Roads, Romsey) (Parking Places, Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting, Prohibition of Driving and Prohibition of Entry) (One Way Street) (Controlled Zone) Consolidation Order 2017. Future occupants would not likely be eligible for parking permits but the applicant should contact Hampshire County Council as the Highways Authority for further information.**

APPLICATION NO. 20/01121/FULLS
SITE Land at Redbridge Lane, Redbridge Lane, Nursling,
SO16 0XN, **NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS**
COMMITTEE DATE 25th August 2020
ITEM NO. 8
PAGE NO. 37 – 55

1.0 CORRECTION

- 1.1 There is a typographical error in Paragraph 5.3 of the report. The reports states '**obscured this ling view**'. It should say '**obscured this long view**'.
- 1.2 In Paragraph 8.29 it does not specifically state the type of affordable housing to be provided. All units of affordable housing will be **shared ownership**, this is in accordance with the terms of the original s106 agreement.

2.0 VIEWING PANEL

- 2.1 A viewing panel was held on 21st August 2020 and was attended by Cllrs Cooper, Bailey and Bundy, A Dowden & C Dowden. Apologies were received from Cllrs Finlay & Gwynne.

APPLICATION NO.	19/01563/FULLS
SITE	Kents Oak Rest Home , Kents Oak, Awbridge, SO51 0HH, AWBRIDGE
COMMITTEE DATE	25 th August 2020
ITEM NO.	9
PAGE NO.	56 - 78

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

1.1 A Viewing panel took place on Friday 21st August 2020.

Attendees:

Cllr Bailey
Cllr Bundy
Cllr Burnage
Cllr Cooper
Cllr A Dowden
Cllr C Dowden
Cllr Parker

Apologies:

None.

2.0 **AMENDMENTS**

2.1 Site plan D-111 B
Site plan with levels D – 111 B
Arboriculture method statement – 17th August 2020

3.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

3.1 Trees - No objection to method statement.

4.0 **REPRESENTATIONS**

4.1 **Unknown x2 via email – For consideration**

Soil on site and levels

- Soil from the Crofton site has been dumped and now levelled across the site, this will have significantly raised the ground level, which I believe will cause problems for the immediate neighbours with run off from surface water in the future.

Trees

- Two large Oak trees on the boundary of the site have TPO's. Branches and the root systems must be taken into consideration at all times. The larger of these trees is the "Kents Oak" and holds a major part of the history of this hamlet and must therefore be protected.
- Several trees surrounding the site have TPO's on them with branch and roots overhanging and running through the site these don't appear to be mentioned in the Developer's tree report.

4.2 **Little Kent's Oak – Ongoing Concerns**

Request a pre-commencement condition on the following

- Confirming the drainage arrangements are acceptable as I do not believe the ditch proposed is a fit for 2.5 metres of drainage per day work has commenced re any planning permission and the road was dug up without any permission from any of the other lane owners.
- a pre-commencement condition on the removal of all the top soil dumped on Kents oak from Crofton.
- Pre-commencement conditions assuring that I will not suffer from any water drainage issues from the new properties that will compromising my property.

Drainage and sewage

- Have we explored improved alternatives for sewage and drainage location away from the lane?
- I request exploration into better alternatives for the sewage and drainage route. E.g. Onto Lockerly road? is this closer to the proposed joint new property sewage treatment?
- I request assurance for the consequences of inappropriate use of non mains sewage treatment by new residents and their direct effect on my enjoyment of my property and any potential health and safety issues of the potential health and safety of footpath users.
- *Please ensure* that there is NO detrimental odour pollution, foul water, or wastewater pollution due unsatisfactory drainage onto my property or the lane or footpath users by these new properties.

Drainage and water run off

The 2 foot increased soil level from unofficial soil dumping from Crofton site. leading to:

- The excess water and current drainage situation onto my property from Kent Oak. New builds likely to cause same issues as CROFTON site.
- The current report does not provide reassurance or address the potential drainage issues these new buildings will have on my property. This needs to be addressed before any development to planning permission is permitted.
- There have been many drainage problems experienced on the Crofton site to date and other new developments in the village, including my property. Additionally, poor drainage at Crofton has resulted in a drainage bore hole being constructed August 2020.
- Excess soil from Crofton has been unofficially dumped on Kents Oaks land increasing the soil level by 2 foot next to my property resulting in drainage issues new builds will exacerbate this.
- I seek assurances that effective steps will be taken to ensure my property is not inundated with runoff water and overload my drainage systems at Little Kents Oak as my concerns have not yet been addressed by the developers to date.
- I request a statement of liability from the building developers to ensure adequate drainage plans are constructed prior to development, to

ensure these issues are not repeated.

Overlooking and heights

- Failure to display the height of the properties on the proposed plans leading to potential light loss to my property.
- Excess soil from Crofton has not been removed – increasing site height. I request that this is removed, and the land is re-levelled back to its original height (as requested over the last 5 months) before any development is undergone as this will affect the height and visibility into my property.
- Concerns of privacy- The plans provided do not identify the height of the building elevations, please could these dimensions be shared.
- The development proposed will also lead to significant block in natural light to the north facing side of my property due to a 'wall' of buildings close to the boundary.
- Plot one's location to my property will result in no privacy from my bedroom, they will be able to look into my room and I will be able to look straight into their living room/ kitchen and upstairs bedrooms.

Failure any plans to identify exact proximity to my property

- Failure to identify proximity of build to Little Kent's Oak border & impact trees roots and health Trees .
- Plot 1 The plan does not show any garden depth figures this will have an impact on the visibility into my property. I request these figures are provided.
- Plot 2 The plans submitted show the garden depth for plot Two to be 10.7 metres from the boundary, this will impact the roots of my fully grown ash tree T13 (40ft + in height). Development that does not take this into consideration may result in serious damage to the trees on my property.
- Tree ref T12 – is pollarded Aug 19 so roots will be impacted by the building and damaged this borders my part of the lane.
- I seek to ensure that the roof height does not block my light and fits in with the surrounding property heights and is not based on Kents oak that is on significantly higher ground.

5.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

5.1 **Soil on site**

The developer has confirmed that the top soil (which is not clay) is required back at the Crofton site to dress the gardens and will be moved by the end of the September. The applicant has noted that the submitted information does not specifically state the FFL or ridge heights and as such has updated the site layout to show these, see drawing D-111 B. The application documents include a site survey with existing levels annotated so the LPA has a record of the ground levels prior to additional soil being placed on the land. It is considered appropriate to apply a condition ensuring the development is provided in accordance with drawing D-111 B. Additional condition 20 is recommended below.

5.2 Trees

Comments have been received in relation to trees which surround the site some of which are subject to TPO the comments raise concern that the trees don't appear to be mentioned in the Developer's tree report. All trees which surround the site are plotted on the Tree Survey Plan and a schedule provided. A method statement has also been submitted to the LPA and has been reviewed by the Tree Officer. An updated condition 8 is recommended to secure compliance with the statement submitted. The method statement has at 1.3.3 information about demolition and construction traffic only using the existing entrance of the entrance track. This will limit the movement of vehicles up the track and impacts on offsite trees.

5.3 Comments have also been received in respect of impacts on the roots of the Hawthorn T14, Ash tree T15, Ash tree T13 and T12 Leyland Cypress. All these trees are plotted on the tree Survey plan and the tree protection fencing and drainage solutions placed to ensure all works are carried out outside the tree protection area.

5.4 Drainage

Sewage and water runoff

Comments received ask whether alternatives for sewage and drainage located away from the lane have been explored. The applicant has confirmed that all options were explored and that the solution submitted is appropriate upon taking advice from the drainage engineer.

5.5 Comments have been received in respect of water inundation to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed development. The presence of soil on site has been explained above in paragraph 4.1. The applicant has confirmed that this will be moved from the application site to Crofton. The submitted drainage technical note sets out how water will be managed on site adequately and this is set out in paragraphs 8.35 and 8.36 of the agenda report. It should be noted that the officer statement at para 8.35 of the agenda report that each property would have a package treatment plant is incorrect. The development would be served by 1 package treatment plant which would be located in the driveway of plot 1.

5.6 Digging up of track previously

A comment has been made in respect of the requirement to dig the road/PROW up without permission from any other of the lane owners to facilitate the drainage solutions previously for Crofton. The Applicant has confirmed that the Lane is an unregistered area of land and the owner has not been known since 1851. All landowners have rights of way to access the properties, so there is no permission required to dig up the road. English Developments Ltd have not dug up the road. Southern Water and SSE have dug a trench across the road, to install the new water main and electric cable respectively, but as a statutory authority they do not require permission. The only element of digging the road in terms of drainage previously is when the owner of Butlers Wood Farm carried out ditch works along the left hand side of the access road.

5.7 Any statement of liability requested by neighbours of the developers to ensure adequate drainage plans are constructed prior to development is private matter between land owners.

5.8 **Overlooking, loss of light and heights**

Comments received state that the application fails to display the height of the properties on the proposed plans leading to potential light loss to properties. The submitted drawings are to scale, however a request has been made to set out the heights of the buildings proposed in writing.

Buildings heights as follows:

	To ridge (at highest point) (approx.)	To eaves (at highest point) (Approx)	Car port (to highest point) (Approx)
Plot 1	8.2m	4.9m	4.6m
Plot 2	7.8m	5.2m	3.9m
Plot 3	8.1m	4.8m	3.8m

In terms of loss of light it is considered that due to the distances described at paragraph 8.13 of the agenda report there would be no significant impacts in this respect experienced at Little Kents Oak.

In respect of overlooking from plot 1 to Little Kents Oak this is discussed at paragraph 8.14 of the agenda report.

5.9 **Plot sizes**

A request has been made for surrounding plot size figures in Awbridge this has been provided by the applicant and is attached to the update paper.

5.10 **New Forest SPA payment**

To confirm this payment was made on the 17th August 2020, the recommendation is updated accordingly.

5.11 **Updated plan**

The site plan number to be approved has been updated to ensure all drainage works are annotated outside of root protection areas. Condition 12 has been updated to reflect updated site plan number D-111 B. This plan also now shows finished proposed levels to be read in conjunction with the existing site survey.

6.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

PERMISSION subject to conditions 1 – 10, updated condition 8 and 12, condition 13 -19 of the agenda report and additional condition 20.

8. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the MJC Tree Service Ltd arboricultural method statement dated 17th August 2020.

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.**
- 12. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers:**
- 00A – Site Survey**
 - D111 B – Site Plan**
 - D210 – Existing Floor Plans**
 - D100- Location plan**
 - D220A – Plot 1 proposed floor plans and elevations**
 - D211 – Plot 2 proposed floor plans and elevations**
 - D221 – Plot 3 proposed floor plans and elevations**
 - D112 – Proposed roof plan**
- Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
- 20. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with drawing no D-111 B which states the proposed GFFL and ridge height.**
- 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) Policy E1**





