

UPDATE PAPER

Southern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 8th December 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 – 8 December 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. **19/02630/FULLS (PERMISSION) 04.11.2019** **11 – 63**
SITE: The Old Mansion Site, Stoneham Lane, South
Eastleigh, **CHILWORTH**

CASE OFFICER: Sarah Barter
8. **20/00327/FULLS (PERMISSION) 24.02.2020** **64 – 88**
SITE: Land at Oak Tree Farm, Foxes Lane, West Wellow,
WELLOW

CASE OFFICER: Mark Staincliffe
10. **20/02518/FULLS (PERMISSION) 23.10.2020** **113 - 125**
SITE: 1 Warwick Close, Chandlers Ford,
VALLEY PARK

CASE OFFICER: Katie Andrew

APPLICATION NO.	19/02630/FULLS
SITE	The Old Mansion Site, Stoneham Lane, South Eastleigh, SO50 9HS, CHILWORTH
COMMITTEE DATE	8 th December 2020
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	11 - 63

1.0 **AMENDMENTS**

- 1.1 Amended drawing for boundary treatments including buffer from SINC– number DD241L04M – received 8th December 2020.
- 1.2 Ecology letter from WYG received 4th December 2020 and lighting strategy dated Dec 2020.

2.0 **CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS**

- 2.1 Ecology – Comment –
Protected sites – Kennel Copse SINC
- Consideration for direct and indirect effects on the neighbouring SINC have not been fully outlined and addressed, for example ongoing recreational pressure, encroachment, noise, buffer zone, cumulative effect from neighbouring NSP, access track.

Protected habitats

- Loss of woodland and area marked for development within the local plan is much smaller than that proposed, with a larger area of the site being ‘woodland’.

Protected species:

Bats - Roosting

- Ongoing management pressure on retained roosts with roads, paths and play equipment within close proximity.
- Unknown location of paths within woodland.

Bats – foraging and commuting

- Loss of woodland on southern woodland corridor and woodland edge habitat – previously identified as important for commuting and foraging bats. Contradicts the mitigation requirements within the bat survey report. Replacement planting location?

Reptiles

- Initial report states that the area has moderate suitability for reptiles, with the habitat to be affected by the proposed development at the time of survey being of negligible potential. Section 5.3.2 of the Ecological Appraisal.
- Neighbouring golf course has suitable reptile habitat and neighbouring North Stoneham identifying adders, slow worms and grass snakes on site – subject to a translocation programme.
- Suitable habitat is due to be lost within the proposed development (0.31ha as stated within the updated ecology letter). Given the moderate suitability of habitats on site for reptiles, neighbouring populations in close proximity, I disagree with the conclusion that reptiles are unlikely to be present. Therefore unable to agree with the conclusion that no further investigation/survey work was considered necessary.

GCN

- Report concludes that 'GCN are present on site'... is this a typo? Given previous findings
- GCN not considered present but previous surveys found other amphibians to be present.

Dormouse

- No dormice in 2017, survey valid until 2020.
- Further justification as to why they are considered to be valid given proximity to known dormouse records (neighbouring site) and habitat being affected by the proposed development.

Ecology surveys

- Ecological Appraisal, Botanical surveys, Dormouse surveys, Invertebrate surveys, bat survey, Badger surveys - States in each that if development does not proceed in the next 2 years, or changes to the proposed development within that time, it is recommended that a review of site conditions is undertaken to determine whether updated surveys are considered necessary.

Proposed mitigation:

- Proposed that a Landscape mitigation strategy should be secured under condition. Not appropriate to condition a mitigation strategy as we need to be confident prior to consent that this can be achieved.
- Species specific mitigation including understorey planting is not mentioned within the management plan, nor species to be planted.
- Location of nest boxes (including Kestral nest box) has not been included.

- 2.2 Leisure and Wellbeing - Comment -
The woodland does not relate to any land TVBC currently manage, locally. Taking into account that Highwood are proposing to use a management company for the onsite POS which borders Kennel Copse, it would make sense that the same company manage this area of woodland as one continuous block. TVBC would not need to manage this area of woodland for it to be publically accessible and I hope this could be secured as part of any legal agreement.
- 2.3 Highways – No further comments to make.
- 2.4 Natural England – No response received.
- 2.5 Hampshire Gardens Trust - No response received.

3.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

3.1 **COM5 b) POS**

Further to the remarks made at paragraph 8.17 the woodland adjacent Homewood is somewhat detached from any land which TVBC currently manage locally as such the Parks and Countryside Manager has advised that it would be sensible for the land to be managed with the rest of the land at this site by a management company. TVBC would not need to manage the woodland for it to be publically accessible and this can confirmed through an appropriate obligation in the legal agreement.

3.2 **Ecology**

Paragraphs 8.61 – 8.64 set out that updates will be provided in respect of impacts on bats, reptiles, newts, the SINC and the woodland. A further letter from the applicant's ecologist a lighting assessment and increased buffer zone between the SINC and residential properties have been submitted. The Council ecologist has responded. Clarification and further comment is provided as follows.

3.3 Bats

An updated lighting strategy has been submitted ensuring the lighting of bat foraging corridors have been fully assessed with the use of low-level bollards. The risk of the proposed development resulting in significant exceedances of 1 lux along potential bat foraging/commuting routes is considered to be low. As such, dark corridors within the woodland on-site are expected to be retained. A condition is added at condition 26 to secure implementation in accordance with this document.

3.4 Further comment has been received from the ecologist in respect of ensuring that the ongoing management pressure on retained roosts and the position within close proximity of roads, paths and play equipment can be assured. Furthermore clarification is sought on the unknown location of paths within woodland and the access status of other woodland areas. The Case Officer has walked the public route through the Copse to the north which links to Home Wood. Other routes shown on site layouts are not for public access and this can be suitably secured as such through the legal agreement. In respect of the retained roosts on site during the construction phase, all suitable trees will be retained and protected by suitable tree protection fencing to prevent disturbance, accidental damage etc. This will result in buffers from construction works such as foundations. Although there will be changes to the landscape with the removal of some trees (albeit many have been removed historically) and construction of new dwellings, the proposed landscape scheme has been designed to compensate for any losses and to make sure that there is no significant loss of foraging or commuting habitat. Therefore there will be no indirect impacts on the viability of these potential roost sites.

3.5 Reptiles

The submitted report states that the area has moderate suitability for reptiles, with the habitat to be affected by the proposed development at the time of survey being of negligible potential. However the Council Ecologist notes that the neighbouring golf course has suitable reptile habitat and neighbouring North Stoneham identified adders, slow worms and grass snakes on site which are subject to a translocation programme. Suitable habitat is due to be lost within the proposed development (0.31ha as stated within the updated ecology letter). Given the moderate suitability of habitats on site for reptiles and neighbouring populations in close proximity, the Council Ecologist disagrees with the conclusion that reptiles are unlikely to be present. It is considered to be reasonable to secure a suitable reptile survey and mitigation where appropriate.

3.6 Great Crested Newts

The report submitted dated May 2020 concludes that 'GCN are present on site'. The applicant has confirmed that as per the overall findings of the report this a typing error. As such no further survey work is required in this respect.

3.7 Dormouse

The Council Ecologist has also highlighted the consideration of dormice. A survey was provided from 2017 which is valid until 2020. However it is considered appropriate to seek further justification as to why the survey is

considered to be valid given proximity to known dormouse records (neighbouring site) and habitat being affected by the proposed development. Therefore the recommendation is made subject to securing suitable reptile survey and mitigation where appropriate.

3.8 SINC and Ancient Woodland

The applicant has confirmed that 2m boundary fences can be provided to deter fly tipping. It is also advised that fencing within the western section of the site may restrict the movement of mammals such as badger and hedgehog. It is proposed that suitable gaps for hedgehogs are provided in all boundary fences. Badgers (which are not recorded on or within 50m of the site) will not be prevented from accessing the woodland buffer areas, nor from accessing the wider woodlands (including Kennel Copse) or open spaces. Furthermore, boundary fencing will not present a significant barrier to badger movement as they will dig under them. The applicants ecologist has recommended an updated badger survey ahead of commencement which the Council Ecologist considers appropriate. This condition has been added to the recommendation at condition 27. The applicant further proposes that if any clear mammal paths are identified during that survey, then suitable two-way badger gates will be installed in intersecting fences.

3.9 The council ecologist has also highlighted that a buffer between the SINC/Woodland is still required to ensure no impacts in terms of health and safety, encroachment and noise on the woodland habitat. No gardens should be included in this buffer zone. The applicant has addressed this point by removing approx. 5m from plots 10 and 11 to provide a buffer and 5m with an additional 3m from plot 9 which are located closest to the SINC and woodland. The access track into the development is within the SINC however an access track has historically always been located here and policy COM5 seeks to ensure that development should be provided through Stoneham Lane and the proposed development at NSP which is where the access links to. The council ecologist highlights that although this is an existing track, works to undertake this will have an impact on the SINC even with mitigation measures within the construction and operational phase. A CEMP is included in the recommendation at condition 15 of the agenda report which seeks to ensure the protection of ecological features in accordance with policy E5 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

3.10 The Council Ecologist has also highlighted that more information is required in respect of replacement planting as a result of some areas of cleared woodland and highlights that the local plan map shows a much smaller area marked for development. As discussed within the agenda report at paragraph 8.2 onwards the reasoning for development within areas marked woodland has been subject to careful scrutiny and survey and as a result it is considered that development can be provided appropriately in these locations to ensure efficient use of the land whilst complying with relevant policies of the Revised Borough local Plan. It is considered appropriate to secure replacement planting detail through the landscape condition 5 which has been amended to include suitable ecological enhancements.

3.11 The Council Ecologist has highlighted that the ecology surveys on file are out of date. The surveys submitted were appropriate at the time of submission in November 2019. Whilst amendments have been made in terms of the design of the mansion apartment in April 2020 and the inclusion of affordable housing at Lakeside view in October 2020 these area have always been proposed for apartments and/or houses and as such it is not considered that the proposals have changed significantly in this time to fundamentally alter the findings of the surveys.

3.12 **Nitrate Neutrality**

A consultation response from Natural England is awaited and the recommendation continues to be subject to a satisfactory consultation response from Natural England in respect of the nitrate mitigation options submitted. It should be noted that Natural England have previously agreed the 4 different options submitted on the neighbouring site at Stoneham where a Care Home has recently been granted permission.

3.13 **Trees**

Paragraph 8.49 advises that an update will be provided in respect of conflict with trees through pipe routing around the recently revised Lakeside View. This has not been provided at this time and as such a condition has been added to the recommendation at condition 28.

3.14 **Boundary between Stoneham Lakes and the proposed development**

The applicant and the Angling club have been in discussion in respect of boundary treatments along the southern boundary of the site. An amended plan has been submitted drawing no DD241L04M proposing an increase in height of the fencing to 1.8m.

3.15 **Impact at angling lakes**

Paragraph 8.81 sets out that a condition will be added to provide further information on the construction of the proposed terrace. This condition was not included in the agenda. This is now included at condition 25.

3.16 **Plans**

The composite drawing of the mansion apartments is attached for information.

3.17 **Corrections**

Paragraph 8.26 – to clarify this application is in relation to residential housing and not a care home complex. Furthermore the paragraph number is missing for heritage considerations this 8.43.

3.18 Paragraph 8.73 – strike 'is' from last sentence *The management of the surface water on site through these means is considered appropriate and the County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection to the proposals is raised subject to appropriate condition.*

4.0 **AMENDED RECOMMENDATION**

Delegate to Head of Planning and building to:

(I) Completion of Legal agreement to secure:

- **The delivery and future management of on-site Affordable Housing**
- **Secure off-site Nitrogen Neutrality mitigation**
- **Financial contributions towards both the New Forest SPA and the Solent SPA to mitigate the impact of development**
- **Provision of, and subsequent management arrangements for, on-site Public Open Space**
- **Maintenance and management arrangements for the Woodland Buffer to Stoneham Golf Club**

(ii) The receipt of a satisfactory consultation reply from Natural England in respect of additional evidence for Nitrate Neutrality

(iii) The receipt of a suitable reptile and dormouse survey and mitigation where appropriate.

Then PERMISSION subject to condition 1 of the agenda report, updated conditions 2, 5, 21 and 23 and condition 3 – 21 24 of the agenda report and additional conditions 25 - 30 and notes:

2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted

plans, numbers

19.034278 C

19.034.101 V

DD241L04M

14-159-1216 C

14-159-1202 H

19.034.240 G

DD241L01 D

DD241L03F

19.034.279 D

14-159-1225 F

14-159-1215 D

14-159-1204 G

14-159-1208 E

14-159-1214 G

14-159-1201 H

19.034.100 O

DD241L02 C

DD241L05B

14-159-1210 E

19/34/SK22 C

19/034/305 B

14-0159-1226 A

19/034/210

14-159-200

19/034/220

19/034/280

14-159-1207 B

19/034/300

19/034/301

19/034/302
19/034/303
19/034/304
19/034/276
19/034/275
19/034/280
14-159-1223
14-159-1222
19.034.002 A
19.034.277 G
14-159-1221
14-159-1219
14-159-1220
19.034.270 E
19.034.271 D
19.034.272 D
19.034.273 C
19.034.300C
19.034.001
19.034.211 C
DD241L06A

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

5. **No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until full details of hard and soft landscape works have been submitted and approved. Details shall include-where appropriate: ecological enhancements; proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.**

Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment such as tree pits); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme and in accordance with the management plan.

Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.

21. **The development shall not be occupied until the boundary treatments detailed in drawing no DD241L04M (comprising all**

boundary treatments across the site including golf ball stop fencing) has been provided. The boundary treatment shall be retained and maintained at all times.

Reason: To ensure security and safety for residents of the proposed development and users of the adjacent angling lakes and golf club in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 Policy LHW4.

- 23. The development shall not be occupied until the 'Woodland Buffer to Stoneham Golf Club' is completed (ie. fences, gates and signage erected) as detailed in drawing no DD241L04 M and the Landscape, Woodland & Ecological Management Plan Rev E has been provided. The 'woodland Buffer to Stoneham Golf club' detail shall be retained and maintained at all times.**

Reason: To ensure security and safety for residents of the proposed development and users of the golf club in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016, policy LHW4.

Additional conditions:

- 25. No development to construct the terrace at the Mansion apartment building shall be begun until details of how the terrace area and associated retaining wall are to be constructed including how the existing historic elements of the site will be used. Details shall include drawings at a scale of 1:50 showing sections and elevations of the proposed terrace area and its relationship with the Angling lake and surrounding land to the south. The terrace and associated works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To sustain the significance of the historic use of the site and to ensure security and safety for residents of the proposed development and users of the adjacent angling lakes in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E9 and LHW4.

- 26. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out within the WYG Lighting Assessment dated December 2020.**

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity, safety and to protect biodiversity in accordance with policies E1, E5 and LHW4 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

- 27. Prior to commencement of development a badger survey shall be undertaken to ensure that the boundary fencing will not present a significant barrier to badger movement. Should any clear mammal paths be identified during that survey, then suitable two-way badger gates shall be installed in intersecting fences where 2m high fencing is provided to deter fly tipping.**

Reason: In the interests of the protection of protected species in accordance with policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 28. Notwithstanding the content of the James Fuller Arboricultural Method Statement and report an appropriately annotated plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority showing the routing of the pipe located to the west of lakeside View to ensure no conflict with tree protection and new planting. The**

pipe routing shall be carried out in accordance with the approved detail.

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.

- 29. Prior to occupation of development the access road permitted under Eastleigh BC application ref: R17/ 79892 shall be completed to its final course layer.**

Reason: To ensure the development is does not have an impact on the function, safety, or character of and accessibility to the local or strategic highway network or rights of way network in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) policy T1.

- 30. The development shall not be permitted to be occupied until such time as the location and design of bird nest boxes (including Kestral nest box) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The nest boxes shall be installed prior to first occupation of the dwellings in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interests of the protection of protected species in accordance with policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

APPLICATION NO.	20/00327/FULLS
SITE	Land At Oak Tree Farm, Foxes Lane, West Wellow, SO51 6EA, WELLOW
COMMITTEE DATE	8 th December 2020
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	64 - 88

1.0 **VIEWING PANEL**

- 1.1 A viewing panel was held on 7th December 2020 and was attended by Cllrs Cooper, Bailey and Bundy, Burnage, A Dowden & C Dowden, Gywnne, Hatley, Parker, Thom, & Warnes.

Apologies were received from Cllrs Johnston & Ward.

2.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

2.1 Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)-

Following our first formal response to this planning application dated 19th August 2020, we received additional information on the 10th September 2020 including a ground investigation report which included infiltration testing in accordance with the BRE365.

- 2.2 The infiltration testing comprised three trial pits: SA1 SA2 and SA2A at depths of: 1.6m, 2.9m and 2.0m respectively. The testing showed good infiltration rates at SA1 and SA2A and could not be completed due to collapse issues at SA2.

- 2.3 However, our formal response missed the fact that the ground investigation report was carried out in August, when groundwater levels are expected to be lower. Therefore, there is a risk of groundwater levels rising during the wet season which could compromise the required 1m unsaturated zone. Therefore, and although the information submitted by the applicant has addressed most of our concerns regarding Surface Water Management and Local Flood Risk, at this stage a groundwater assessment that includes seasonal variations (winter months) should be submitted to demonstrate that infiltration is feasible at the application site.

2.4 Planning Officer Comment

The applicant is aware of the new comments from the LLFA and has undertaken the additional testing. This information and report is not currently available for consideration, but will be available before the end of December. The applicant's appointed consultant is confident that the issue identified can be resolved.

- 2.5 Due to the late comments of the LLFA the recommendation has been updated to reflect the need to achieve a satisfactory solution prior to the grant of planning permission as set out in Paragraph 5.0 below.

3.0 **REPRESENTATIONS**

- 3.1 Since the drafting of the agenda report a further 2 representations have been

received, setting out the following concerns:

- I am concerned not to be able to trace any confirmation as to how Mr Manzanero of H.C.C. SWM department could remove objections as it is still impossible to provide his requested soil survey to confirm 1m of unsaturated Zone between the base of the infiltration features, and the highest groundwater level recorded including winter months, as the initial trial pits were only dug in the height of summer this year. There will be huge risk of water inundation, if this request cannot be satisfied, and all of this BEFORE any rain from the huge roof area has also been dumped on the site. We are only two days into winter months, so I ask however compliance could be confirmed as of now?
- The report and HRA is wrong. The site is within Mottisfont SAC Buffer Zone.
- The pond would be an ideal feeding ground for bats.
- No bat survey has been submitted with the application. The application is not valid.

4.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Para 8.20 of the SAPC report and the content of the HRA clearly state that the site is within Mottisfont Bat Special Area of Conservation Buffer Zone. The HRA has been undertaken on that basis and the conclusions have been checked by Natural England. No objection is raised to the conclusions reached in the HRA.

- 4.1 The HRA does state that the site is not within the SAC as that is approximately 10km away. The designation is centred on a Grid Reference (SU322297) close to the village of Mottisfont and comprises an area of approximately 196.55Ha. It is also confirmed that:

“The Mottisfont woodland supports an important population of the rare **barbastelle** *Barbastella barbastellus*. It is one of only six known maternity sites in the UK (2002 data) and the only one in Hampshire. Mottisfont contains a mix of woodland types including hazel coppice with standards, broadleaved plantation and coniferous plantation which the bats use for breeding, roosting, commuting and feeding.” (source: <https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/site/UK0030334>)

As a matter of fact the site is not within the SAC and the SAC is 10km away. However, the application site is within the 7.5km of the SAC and the HRA goes on to quantify the issue. The HRA states that the bats commute up to 7.5km from the SAC, the 7.5km being taken from the outer edge of the SAC. Both the Council’s HRA and the officer report to Committee clearly assess the potential for an indirect effect on the interests of the Mottisfont bats SAC arising from the proposed development and the conclusion the proposed development would not adversely affect those interests is clearly set out.

- 4.2 The comments relating to the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) are noted and addressed in paragraphs 2.4-2.5 above. The recommendation is amended to ensure this matter is satisfactorily resolved prior to the grant of planning permission.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION

Delegate to the Head of Planning & Building to:

- **Allow the submission, and consideration, of additional surface water drainage information requested by the Local Lead Flood Authority;**
- **To consult with the Hampshire County Council acting as Local Lead Flood Authority, and to receive a satisfactory consultation reply that the proposal would not adversely affect drainage conditions in the vicinity of the site, and.**
- **Impose any reasonable additional or amended conditions considered necessary following that process, to adequately deal with surface water disposal, then**

PERMISSION subject to conditions and notes as per the main report recommendation.

APPLICATION NO.	20/02518/FULLS
SITE	1 Warwick Close, Chandlers Ford, VALLEY PARK
COMMITTEE DATE	8 th December 2020
ITEM NO.	10
PAGE NO.	113 - 125

1.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

1.1 **Tree Officer:** No objection subject to conditions.

2.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

2.1 **Shadow diagrams – impact on living conditions of neighbouring property A**
shadow diagram using a sun on the ground indicator for the 21st March has been undertaken where a comparison between proposed and existing situations can be undertaken. These are attached to the Update Paper. The diagrams show that the existing 1.8 metre boundary fence along the shared boundary between 1 and 2 Warwick Close casts a shadow on the conservatory and a portion of the rear garden within 2 Warwick Close throughout the day. It is considered that the proposed development would not materially change the amount of shadow experienced by this neighbouring property and confirms the necessity of stepping the proposed development off the common boundary. It is considered the proposed development would not unacceptably impact the living conditions of 2 Warwick Close with regard to sunlight provision.

2.2 **Impact on trees**

The recommendation has been updated to reflect the Tree Officers consultation response.

3.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

PERMISSION subject to conditions 1-5 and notes 1-2 of the agenda report recommendation, and additional condition:

6. No activities, nor material storage, nor placement of site huts or other equipment, no service routes, drain runs, soakaways or excavations in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be undertaken within the tree protection 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.