

Minutes of the **Northern Area Planning Committee**
of the **Test Valley Borough Council**
held in Conference Room 1, Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road, Andover
on Thursday, 31 March 2022 at 5.30 pm

Attendance:

Councillor C Borg-Neal (Chairman) **Councillor T Burley (Vice-Chairman)**

Councillor Z Brooks
Councillor J Budzynski
Councillor C Ecclestone
Councillor L Lashbrook

Councillor P Lashbrook
Councillor N Lodge
Councillor J Neal
Councillor K North

Also in attendance

Councillor N Matthews

Councillor T Tasker

531

Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Coole and Harber.

532

Public Participation

In accordance with the Council's scheme of Public Participation, the following spoke on the applications indicated:

<u>Agenda Item No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Application</u>	<u>Speaker</u>
7	10 - 49	21/02943/FULLN	Parish Councillor Long (Andover Town Council) Mr Philpott (Objector) and Mr Garnett (Objector) Councillor Matthews (Ward Member)

533

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

534

Urgent Items

There were no urgent items to consider.

535

Minutes

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

536

Schedule of Development Applications

Resolved:

That the applications for development as set out below be determined as indicated.

537

21/02943/FULLN

APPLICATION NO.	21/02943/FULLN
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
REGISTERED	07.10.2021
APPLICANT	Mr Tom Mitchell
SITE	Land west of Finkley Farm Road, East Anton, Andover, ANDOVER TOWN (ROMANS)
PROPOSAL	Erection of 130 dwellings and a 375sqm Class E retail convenience store, including access, parking, open space, landscaping and a sustainable urban drainage system (SuDS)
AMENDMENTS	Letter received 10 th January responding to LLFA's comments
CASE OFFICER	Mrs Samantha Owen

REFUSED for the reasons:

- 1. The development has failed to demonstrate adequate visibility splays on the internal road between plots 52 and 57 which would have an adverse impact on the function and safety of the local highway network and would not accord with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 2. The development has failed to demonstrate that the Swept Path analysis of the internal road between plots 52 and 57 can accommodate an 11.2 metre refuse vehicle without it encroaching onto the opposite side of the internal access road which would**

- bring it into conflict with other vehicles as such this would not be safe and would have an adverse impact on the function and safety of the local highway network and would not accord with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
3. The submitted Travel Plan does not support and promote the use of sustainable transport and as such it does not accord with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
 4. There is a shortfall in 4 visitor spaces across the Parcel for which no adequate justification has been put forward that would allow for a reduction in visitor spaces against the standards as set out in Annexe G of the RLP, which is likely to result in on street parking that would impact the operation and safety of the internal road network and therefore does not accord with Policy T2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
 5. Plots 1-12, 44-52, 67 and 68 are likely to encourage on street parking along Dairy Road and Finkley Farm Road. Parking on the road will hinder the free flow of traffic along these routes resulting in an adverse impact on the safety and character of the local highway network and would be contrary to Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
 6. The parking for plots 113-118 is poorly designed in terms of its relationship with the dwelling it is allocated to. Plots 28, 51, 52, 67, 94 and 95 have allocated parking that is somewhat remote from the unit it serves. It is not considered that parking for these plots is well designed or appropriately located and therefore does not accord with Policy T2 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016.
 7. Parking spaces are required to be well designed and practical. A number of parking spaces are constrained on one or both sides by retaining walls, in these instances parking spaces should be 2.7 metres wide if constrained on one side and 3 metres wide if constrained on two sides, Plots 15, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 78, 79, 89 and 90 are impacted in this way, however the car parking spaces for these units are still measuring 2.4 metres wide. This is not considered to be well designed parking and as such is contrary to Policy T2 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016.
 8. It is considered that the proposed development does not represent high quality development as required by Policy E1. The layout relies on retaining walls and underbuilding which are an incongruous and alien feature that are considered visually intrusive. The elevation design of the Apartment Blocks, the Retail Block and the FOGS results in bland, oppressive and overbearing buildings that would fail to improve the character and quality of the area. Also the use of render as a material throughout the development presents a stark addition against the backdrop of the wider development and the landscaping. It is not considered that the development would accord with Policy E1 of the RLP or paragraph 71 of the National Design Guide.

- 9. The proposed Plots 67, 92, and 123 -130 are located in close proximity to the existing trees that have been planted alongside Finkley Farm Road as such this will potentially impact the long term retention and health of these trees through requests for the trees to be pruned or felled as they mature and grow. The proposed development is contrary to policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 10. The proposed layout has resulted in large areas of parking with little or no significant landscaping resulting in large areas that are dominated by hard surfacing which is detrimental to the overall landscape character of the area and does not integrate, complement or enhance the character of the Borough As such does not accord with Policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 11. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed infiltration basin is required to be the size, depth and shape as proposed it therefore cannot be concluded that the infiltration basin would not be a visually intrusive feature within the landscape. As such this feature would not accord with Policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 12. The POS as proposed is made up of open space and Swales, the latter of which are undulating and at certain times of the year likely to have standing water within them, this does not address the shortfall of the specific type of POS within the Ward. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the shortfall of specific type of POS within the Ward the proposed development fails to provide sufficient public open space required to serve the needs of the future population and no arrangements for its long term maintenance have been made. The proposal would therefore result in unnecessary additional burden being placed on existing public open space provision adversely affecting the function and quality of these facilities, to the overall detriment of the area and users of the open space. The arrangements for the long term management and maintenance of the proposed POS have also not been secured. The proposal is contrary to policies COM15 and LHW1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016), and the Infrastructure and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2009).**
- 13. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the provision of and financial contribution towards on site new affordable housing, including their subsequent retention in perpetuity to occupation by households in housing need and ensuring that the units are dispersed throughout the development and meet local need in terms of the size, type and tenure of the units in accordance with the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document the proposal is contrary to policy COM7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and the Infrastructure and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2021).**

- 14. The layout and design of the proposed development fails to provide defensible space to vulnerable elevations of the Apartment blocks and would not allow for adequate natural surveillance of the rear parking areas leading to a greater risk of crime and anti-social behaviour. The proposal is contrary to policy CS1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 15. In the absence of a Legal Agreement to secure off site mitigation for nutrient neutrality the development at this time does not achieve nutrient neutrality. As such, it cannot be concluded that the proposal will not result in a likely harmful significant effect on the internationally designated nature conservation sites in the Solent, in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations and as advised within guidance from Natural England. As such, the proposal fails to comply with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 16. The proposed flats over garages and apartment blocks, plots 4-12, 69-77, 123-130, 13, 24, 53, 80 and 106 have no private amenity space for future occupiers which conflicts with Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016.**

(The meeting terminated at 6.13 pm)