

## Notice of Meeting

# Southern Area Planning Committee

**Date:** Tuesday 25 April 2023

**Time:** 5.30 pm

**Venue:** Main Hall, Crosfield Hall, Broadwater Road, Romsey, Hampshire,  
SO51 8GL

**For further information or enquiries please contact:**

Caroline Lovelock - 01264 368000  
clovelock@testvalley.gov.uk

**Legal and Democratic Service**

Test Valley Borough Council,  
Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road,  
Andover, Hampshire,  
SP10 3AJ

[www.testvalley.gov.uk](http://www.testvalley.gov.uk)

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEME**

*If members of the public wish to address the meeting they should notify the  
Legal and Democratic Service at the Council's Beech Hurst office by noon  
on the working day before the meeting.*

### **Membership of Southern Area Planning Committee**

#### **MEMBER**

#### **WARD**

Councillor M Cooper (Chairman)

Romsey Tadburn

Councillor G Bailey (Vice-Chairman)

Blackwater

Councillor P Bundy

Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams

Councillor J Burnage

Romsey Cupernham

Councillor A Dowden

Valley Park

Councillor C Dowden

North Baddesley

Councillor S Gidley

Romsey Abbey

Councillor M Hatley

Ampfield & Braishfield

Councillor I Jeffrey

Mid Test

Councillor A Johnston

Mid Test

Councillor M Maltby

Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams

Councillor J Parker

Romsey Tadburn

Councillor A Warnes

North Baddesley



## **Southern Area Planning Committee**

Tuesday 25 April 2023

### **AGENDA**

**The order of these items may change as a result of members  
of the public wishing to speak**

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 Declarations of Interest**
- 3 Urgent Items**
- 4 Public Participation**
- 5 Minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2023**
- 6 Information Notes 4 - 9**
- 7 21/02697/RESS - 13.09.2021 10 - 59**

**(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL)**

SITE: Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road,  
Flexford, SO52 9BH, **AMPFIELD**  
CASE OFFICER: Graham Melton

- 8 21/02965/OUTS - 11.10.2021 60 - 79**

**(OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION)**

SITE: Land To The Rear of The Paddocks, Winchester  
Road, Ampfield, SO51 9BG, **AMPFIELD**  
CASE OFFICER: Kate Levey

## ITEM 6

# TEST VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE INFORMATION NOTES

### **Availability of Background Papers**

Background papers may be inspected up to five working days before the date of the Committee meeting and for four years thereafter. Requests to inspect the background papers, most of which will be on the application file, should be made to the case officer named in the report or to the Development Manager. Although there is no legal provision for inspection of the application file before the report is placed on the agenda for the meeting, an earlier inspection may be agreed on application to the Head of Planning and Building.

### **Reasons for Committee Consideration**

The majority of applications are determined by the Head of Planning and Building in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation which is set out in the Council's Constitution. However, some applications are determined at the Area Planning Committees and this will happen if any of the following reasons apply:

- (a) Applications which are contrary to the provisions of an approved or draft development plan or other statement of approved planning policy where adverse representations have been received and which is recommended for approval.
- (b) Applications (excluding notifications) where a Member requests in writing, with reasons and within the Application Publicity Expiry Date, that they be submitted to Committee. A Member can withdraw this request at any time prior to the determination of the application to enable its determination under delegated powers.
- (c) Applications submitted by or on behalf of the Council, or any company in which the Council holds an interest, for its own developments except for the approval of minor developments.
- (d) Applications where the Head of Planning and Building Services recommends refusal of an application solely on the basis of failure to achieve nutrient neutrality where a Ward Member requests in writing, with reasons, within 72 hours of notification of the recommendation for refusal that they be submitted to Committee for determination. A Member can withdraw this request at any time prior to the determination of the application to enable its determination under delegated powers.
- (e) To determine applications (excluding applications for advertisement consent, certificates of lawfulness, listed building consent, and applications resulting from the withdrawal by condition of domestic permitted development rights;

Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes B, C, D, E, F, G, and H of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 or as amended) on which a material planning objection(s) has been received within the Application Publicity Expiry Date and which cannot be resolved by negotiation or through the imposition of conditions and where the officer's recommendation is for approval, following consultation with the Ward Members, the latter having the right to request that the application be reported to Committee for decision.

### **Public Speaking at the Meeting**

The Council has a public participation scheme, which invites members of the public, Parish Council representatives and applicants to address the Committee on applications. Full details of the scheme are available from Planning and Building Services or from Democratic Services at the Council Offices, Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road, Andover. Copies are usually sent to all those who have made representations. Anyone wishing to speak must book with the Democratic Services within the stipulated time period otherwise they will not be allowed to address the Committee.

Speakers are limited to a total of three minutes per item for Councillors on the Area Committee who have personal interests or where a Member has pre-determined his/her position on the relevant application, three minutes for the Parish Council, three minutes for all objectors, three minutes for all supporters and three minutes for the applicant/agent and relevant Ward Members who are not Committee Members will have a maximum of five minutes. Where there are multiple supporters or multiple objectors wishing to speak the Chairman may limit individual speakers to less than three minutes with a view to accommodating multiple speakers within the three minute time limit. Speakers may be asked questions by the Members of the Committee, but are not permitted to ask questions of others or to join in the debate. Speakers are not permitted to circulate or display plans, photographs, illustrations or textual material during the Committee meeting as any such material should be sent to the Members *and* officers in advance of the meeting to allow them time to consider the content.

### **Content of Officer's Report**

It should be noted that the Officer's report will endeavour to include a summary of the relevant site characteristics, site history, policy issues, consultations carried out with both internal and external consultees and the public and then seek to make a professional judgement as to whether permission should be granted. However, the officer's report will usually summarise many of the issues, particularly consultations received from consultees and the public, and anyone wishing to see the full response must ask to consult the application file.

## **Status of Officer's Recommendations and Committee's Decisions**

The recommendations contained in this report are made by the officers at the time the report was prepared. A different recommendation may be made at the meeting should circumstances change and the officer's recommendations may not be accepted by the Committee.

In order to facilitate debate in relation to an application, the Chairman will move the officer's recommendations in the report, which will be seconded by the Vice Chairman. Motions are debated by the Committee in accordance with the Council's Rules of Procedure. A binding decision is made only when the Committee has formally considered and voted in favour of a motion in relation to the application and, pursuant to that resolution, the decision notice has subsequently been issued by the Council.

## **Conditions and Reasons for Refusal**

Suggested reasons for refusal and any conditions are set out in full in the officer's recommendation.

Officers or the Committee may add further reasons for refusal or conditions during the Committee meeting and Members may choose to refuse an application recommended for permission by the Officers or to permit an application recommended for refusal. In all cases, clear reasons will be given, by whoever is promoting the new condition or reason for refusal, to explain why the change is being made.

## **Decisions subject to Completion of a Planning Obligation**

For some applications, a resolution is passed to grant planning permission subject to the completion of an appropriate planning obligation (often referred to as a Section 106 agreement). The obligation can restrict development or the use of the land, require operations or activities to be carried out, require the land to be used in a specified way or require payments to be made to the authority.

New developments will usually be required to contribute towards the infrastructure required to serve a site and to cater for additional demand created by any new development and its future occupants. Typically, such requirements include contributions to community facilities, village halls, parks and play areas, playing fields and improvements to roads, footpaths, cycleways and public transport.

Upon completion of the obligation, the Head of Planning and Building is delegated to grant permission subject to the listed conditions. However, it should be noted that the obligation usually has to be completed sufficiently in advance of the planning application determination date to allow the application to be issued. If this does not happen, the application may be refused for not resolving the issues required within the timescale set to deal with the application.

## **Deferred Applications**

Applications may not be decided at the meeting for a number of reasons as follows:

- \* The applicant may choose to withdraw the application. No further action would be taken on that proposal and the file is closed.
- \* Officers may recommend deferral because the information requested or amended plans have not been approved or there is insufficient time for consultation on amendments.
- \* The Committee may resolve to seek additional information or amendments.
- \* The Committee may resolve to visit the site to assess the effect of the proposal on matters that are not clear from the plans or from the report. These site visits are not public meetings.

## **Visual Display of Plans and Photographs**

Plans are included in the officers' reports in order to identify the site and its surroundings. The location plan will normally be the most up-to-date available from Ordnance Survey and to scale. The other plans are not a complete copy of the application plans and may not be to scale, particularly when they have been reduced from large size paper plans. If further information is needed or these plans are unclear please refer to the submitted application on the Council's website. Plans displayed at the meeting to assist the Members may include material additional to the written reports.

Photographs are used to illustrate particular points on most of the items and the officers usually take these. Photographs submitted in advance by applicants or objectors may be used at the discretion of the officers.

## **Human Rights**

The European Convention on Human Rights" ("ECHR") was brought into English Law, via the Human Rights Act 1998 ("HRA"), as from October 2000.

The HRA introduces an obligation on the Council to act consistently with the ECHR.

There are 2 Convention Rights likely to be most relevant to Planning Decisions:

- \* Article 1 of the 1st Protocol - The Right to the Enjoyment of Property.
- \* Article 8 - Right for Respect for Home, Privacy and Family Life.

It is important to note that these types of right are not unlimited - although in accordance with the EU concept of "proportionality", any interference with these rights must be sanctioned by Law (e.g. by the Town & Country Planning Acts) and must go no further than necessary.

Essentially, private interests must be weighed against the wider public interest and against competing private interests. Such a balancing exercise is already implicit in the decision making processes of the Committee. However, Members must specifically bear Human Rights issues in mind when reaching decisions on all planning applications and enforcement action.

### **Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC)**

The Council has a duty under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 as follows: "*every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity*".

It is considered that this duty has been properly addressed within the process leading up to the formulation of the policies in the Revised Local Plan. Further regard is had in relation to specific planning applications through completion of the biodiversity checklists for validation, scoping and/or submission of Environmental Statements and any statutory consultations with relevant conservation bodies on biodiversity aspects of the proposals. Provided any recommendations arising from these processes are conditioned as part of any grant of planning permission (or included in reasons for refusal of any planning application) then the duty to ensure that biodiversity interest has been conserved, as far as practically possible, will be considered to have been met.

### **Other Legislation**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that determination of applications be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for the Borough comprises the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016), and 'made' Neighbourhood Plans. Material considerations are defined by Case Law and includes, amongst other things, draft Development Plan Documents (DPD), Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and other relevant guidance including Development Briefs, Government advice, amenity considerations, crime and community safety, traffic generation and safety.

In July 2021 the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The revised NPPF replaced and superseded the previous NPPF published in 2018. The revised NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.

So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the revised NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This does not change the statutory status of the development plan as a starting point for decision making. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where a planning application conflicts with an up to date development plan, permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions which depart from an up to date development plan,

but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

For decision-taking, applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development means:

- Approving development proposals that accord with an up to date development plan without delay; or
- Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, granting permission unless:
  - The application of policies in the revised NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
  - Any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the revised NPPF when taken as a whole.

Existing Local Plan policies should not be considered out of date because they were adopted prior to the publication of the revised NPPF. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the revised NPPF (the closer the policies in the Local Plan to the policies in the revised NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

## ITEM 7

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	21/02697/RESS
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	RESERVED MATTERS - SOUTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	13.09.2021
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Senior Living (Chandler's Ford) Ltd
<b>SITE</b>	Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road, Flexford, SO52 9BH, <b>AMPFIELD</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Approval of details for appearance, landscaping, and layout of a care village pursuant to outline planning permission 17/01615/OUTS
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	Received on 13.07.2022, 18.11.2022 and 17.02.2023: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Amended Plans and Elevations reflecting amended elevation detailing.</li></ul>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Graham Melton

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

[Click here to view application](#)

---

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of Local Ward Members as there is significant local interest.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The wider application site comprises an open parcel of land measuring approximately 4.05ha in total, located on the north-west side of Baddesley Road. The application site benefits from a previous outline planning permission to be redeveloped for care accommodation (application reference 17/01615/OUTS, paragraph 4.7).
- 2.2 The current proposal relates to an area measuring approximately 2.75ha, located adjacent to the western boundaries with Monks Brook and Flexford Close and also includes the section of the application site bordering Baddesley Road and Wheelhouse Park to the south and east.
- 2.3 The residual land within the centre of the application site is the location of the recently approved Village Centre building and three storey block of accommodation which is currently under construction (application reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.4).
- 2.4 Previously the application site was in use for industrial and storage purposes as defined by the lawful development certificate issued under application reference 16/01889/CLES, paragraph 4.10.



3.0 **PROPOSAL**

3.1 The proposal has been submitted pursuant to Outline planning permission 17/001615/OUTS (paragraph 4.7). The submission seeks approval of the following details aspects:

- Appearance
- Landscaping
- Layout

3.2 Within this proposal the following schedule of accommodation is proposed across a total of 17 separate two storey buildings:

<b>Block Number</b>	<b>Amount and Type of Accommodation</b>
Block 1	2 x 2 bed
Block 2	4 x 2 bed
Block 3	7 x 2 bed
Block 4	2 x 1 bed 4 x 2 bed
Block 5	8 x 2 bed
Block 6	6 x 2 bed
Block 6A	2 x 2 bed
Block 7	6 x 2 bed
Block 8	8 x 2 bed
Block 9	8 x 2 bed
Block 11	4 x 2 bed
Block 12	4 x 2 bed
Block 13	3 x 2 bed
Block 14	7 x 2 bed
Block 14A	2 x 2 bed
Block 17	6 x 2 bed
Block 19	8 x 2 bed
<b>Total</b>	<b>91 units -</b> 2 x 1 bed units 89 x 2 bed units

- 3.3 Previously, reserved matters approval was granted for the main village centre building and a single 3 storey block of accommodation under application reference 20/00488/RESS (paragraph 4.4). These buildings are currently under construction and will provide 57 extra care units in total. In combination with the current reserved matters proposal, a total of 148 units would be delivered onsite with 48 units within the main Village Centre building and 100 units distributed across 18 separate accommodation buildings.
- 4.0 **RECENT HISTORY**
- 4.1 **21/02555/FULLS** – Change of use of the land to accommodate the erection of a marketing suite in connection with the redevelopment of the site to provide a care village under permission ref. 17/01615/OUTS, including associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping, for a temporary period of 3 years. *Temporary permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 10.03.2022.*
- 4.2 **20/02916/FULLS** – Construction of new access road and junction, including repositioning of existing bus stop, erection of entrance feature wall, associated landscaping, lighting and stopping up of existing access. *Permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 30.03.2021.*
- 4.3 **20/02080/ADVS** - Display of hoarding advertisement and 2 x flagpole advertisements during construction period. *Consent subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 19.10.2020.*
- 4.4 **20/00488/RESS** – Approval of details for appearance, landscaping, and layout of pursuant of a care village pursuant to outline planning permission 17/01615/OUTS. *Approval subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 23.12.2020.*
- 4.5 **19/00616/FULLS** - Erection of a storage/office building for Wheelhouse Park with associated parking, landscaping and access. *Permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 30.05.2019.*
- 4.6 **19/00471/RESS** - Details of Layout, Appearance and Landscaping for the part of the site which is intended to be developed for the provision of a storage/office building for Wheelhouse Park only. *Application withdrawn on 26.03.2019.*
- 4.7 **17/01615/OUTS** - Outline application for demolition of existing industrial buildings and re-development to form a Care Village (Use Class C2), comprising 2-3 storey care home building/community hub containing up to either 65 no. care beds or up to 48 no. "extra care" units and core facilities: a series of 2-2.5 storey buildings containing up to 101 no.1 and 2 bedroom "extra care" units; single vehicular access from Baddesley Road (including retained access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park); associated car and cycle parking spaces; provision of associated outdoor amenity space; provision of semi-natural "ecological" buffer zone and grassland; proposed new landscaping/tree planting; provision of on-site drainage; and undergrounding of existing overhead electricity lines. New barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park (Class B8/B1 - "sui generis"). *Outline permission, decision issued on 27.09.2018.*

- 4.8 **17/00616/OUTS** - Outline application for a Care Village following demolition of existing industrial buildings comprising 65 no. bed, 2-3 storey care home (Class C2); 87 no. 'extra care' units (Class C2); community building (up to 280 sq. m. GFA) (Class D1); 16 no. 'age restricted retirement dormer bungalows' (Class C3); new convenience store (up to 280 sq. m. GFA) (Class A1); new barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park (100-120 sq. m. GFA) (Class B8/B1 - 'sui generis'); with single vehicular access from Baddesley Road (including retained access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park); new pedestrian access from Baddesley Road to convenience store; associated car and cycle parking spaces; provision of associated outdoor amenity space; provision of semi-natural 'ecological' buffer zone and grassland; proposed new landscaping/tree planting; provision of on-site drainage; and undergrounding of existing overhead electricity lines. *Application withdrawn on 15.05.2017.*
- 4.9 **17/00637/SCRS** - Screening Opinion under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 - Demolition of existing industrial buildings and redevelopment of site to provide 'Care Village' including new convenience store, car and cycle parking provision, outdoor amenity space and new barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park. *Environmental Impact Assessment not required, decision issued on 05.04.2017.*
- 4.10 **16/01889/CLES** - Mixed use of the land and existing buildings for general industrial (with ancillary offices)(Class B2); light industrial (Class B1 (c)); storage and distribution (Class B8) together with the use for the parking of commercial vehicles and caravans along with the use for the purposes of a water pumping - station. *Certificate issued on 02.11.2016.*

## 5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

### 5.1 **Ecology** – No objection (summarised).

- Following the submission of the amended and additional information, objections previously raised have been overcome.
- Provided the works proceed in accordance with the condition details approved for the outline consent, then no further concerns are raised in respect to the proposed layout and landscaping.

### 5.2 **Highways** – No objection.

### 5.3 **Landscape** – Objection (summarised).

- Additional information has been submitted that addresses previous issues however there are still a couple of areas of concern.
- Additional photomontages have been submitted, these give a very accurate indication of the impact of the proposed buildings particularly from Flexford Close.

- The proposed landscaping has been shown at implementation and up to 15 years, whilst this gives an indication of establishment, the proposed planting is indicated to be on the banks of Monks Brook and it is considered that the growth and establishment is overly optimistic.
- It is also noted that the photomontages are shown in summer months when the trees are in full leaf.
- The majority of species shown in the photomontages appear to be birch, although these are fast growing trees they have a limited life span and will do little to provide screening during winter months.
- The proposed screening needs to be reconsidered with more trees and variety to create a more robust screen.
- A landscape plan has been overlaid with drainage, which is really useful, once the other utilities have been added an updated plan is required to ensure that all utilities work with landscaping.

5.4 **Natural England** – No comment at the time of writing.

5.5 **Trees** – Objection (summarised).

- Additional information has addressed some of the initial concerns but there are still some concerns outstanding.
- The proposed accommodation does not allow for replacement planting along the top of the bank adjacent to Monks Brook.
- New trees are shown in small landscaping areas, no information has been provided to demonstrate that these trees have the soil volume requirement available to them to succeed.
- More information regarding planting areas and soil volumes is required.
- A landscape plan has been overlaid with drainage, this demonstrates that drainage will not conflict with new trees and planting but there is still no information regarding other services and utilities.

5.6 **TVBC Environmental Services (Refuse)** – Objection (summarised).

- Understand that a balance has to be struck between the distance that individual households have to walk with their waste and recycling and the time taken for TVBC staff to collect waste from 18 separate bin stores.
- Would hope that more bin stores could have been merged together to rationalise collections.
- If this is not possible then every option for speeding up the collections need to be explored and implemented, a particular need is the reduction to the distance which the collection team have to walk and collect their bins.
- Welcome the offer from the developer for the care village operator to move the bins but this commitment needs to result in bins being positioned within 15 metres not 25 metres.

- Note from the submitted information that there are 5 bin stores that require the care village staff to move the bins out to the collection points, this arrangement would need to be formally recognised within the approved documentation.
- Temporary collection points are a good idea but the fewer of them as possible would be beneficial given the anticipated increase of refuse collections and added complexity arise from future food waste collections.
- The vehicle tracking exercise does not show the refuse vehicle entering the parking courts closer to the bin stores but travelling along the main internal access road and turning around at the rear of the application site.
- This arrangement triggers the need for the 5 temporary collection points referred to above.
- Challenge the premise that all the residents must have 240 litre bins, even used communally, 1100 litre bins work perfectly well in other retirement schemes.
- Emptying many small bins from 18 bin stores will greatly add to the time taken to collect waste, extra space will also be needed for 140 litre food waste bins.
- Also suggest that each bin store is numbered so that if there are any problems with waste or recycling collections, can bring the management agents attention to the correct bin store.
- Always favour brick-built bin stores as this design reduces problems with leaf litter accumulations and problems with vermin, future waste collections will include food waste collected every 3 weeks.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 20.12.2022

6.1 **Ampfield Parish Council** – Objection (summarised from 4 separate responses).

- Although the Parish Council continue to support the proposal in principle and stands by comments on previous applications for the site, believe that the current proposal differs substantially from the outline application in terms of the ground levels of the site adjacent to Monks Brook and Flexford Close.
- Nine residents from Flexford Close attended the Parish Council meeting to make representations about the ground levels, including one individual who spoke on behalf of 35 residents.
- Further meetings were also attended by a number of residents raising concerns.

*Layout*

- A comparison exercise has been undertaken between the section drawings provided with the outline application and the current application, demonstrating that the levels in the current proposal are approximately one storey higher.
- The effect of the new proposed elevated ground levels is that instead of being one storey higher, the proposed buildings are two storeys higher than the existing dwellings in Flexford Close.

- Appears to be contrary to the developer's own design statement in the outline application which stated that building heights would generally respect existing topography and levels.
- Reference in applicant's supporting information to the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act as driving the need for increased ground levels, but this legislation was replaced by the Equalities Act 2010.
- Contrary to Policy E1 of the Local Plan which requires development to integrate, respect and complement the character of the area in relation to scale and building style.
- The effect of the increased proposed ridge heights will dominate the skyline as viewed from Flexford Close contrary to paragraph 7.10 of the local plan.
- Proposed buildings were shown to face away from Flexford Close on the original outline plans but now face the properties aligning Flexford Close.
- Proposed buildings will overlook existing dwellings to such an extent that it will not be possible to be screened by fences or hedges of normal domestic scale.
- Proposed planting allows for screening using deciduous trees but these will not serve the purpose of providing much screening during winter months.
- A few evergreen trees will provide much better screening and more interesting view.
- Proposed buildings will overshadow dwellings in Flexford Close, which will be especially problematic during winter.
- Impact of lighting is greater due to increased ground levels.

*Other matters*

- Note that this may be a matter for Building Control rather than a planning issue, but concerned that there may be a possibility of contamination dissolving into the ground water and being washed into the brook.

6.2 **87 letters of objection;** (summarised).

- Proposed plans differ greatly from the outline permission and demonstrate planning creep.
- Submitted amendments do not overcome concerns raised originally.
- NPPF.

6.3 Layout, Landscaping and Appearance

*Layout*

- Very high ground levels, at the very least 2 meters above what the ground level shown on previous planning applications.
- Amendments undertaken still result in ground levels 1.5 meters above current ground levels.
- Submitted justification for ground level increase is not credible.

- The submitted drainage technical note refers to a height of 41.5m AOD but this is the level at the top of the hill that the main building is built into, the entrance and exists are much lower so this does not serve as sufficient justification of the ground level increase.
  - Ground floor of some of the buildings will be the same height as the eaves of some of the houses on Flexford Close.
  - Proposed levels should return the same height as shown and discussed at earlier applications.
  - Scale and bulk resulting in loss of light.
  - Height of the proposed buildings will be far more imposing and cut out much more light than the original plan.
  - Proposed buildings will result in a loss of daylight and sunlight for Flexford Close residents.
  - Single storey buildings should be placed near to the boundary if ground levels cannot be reduced.
  - Proposed buildings should be moved back from the boundary with Flexford Close, they are too close to the neighbouring properties and only 18-20 meters away.
  - Request the removal of Block 6A to allow for more openness between the buildings.
  - Very concerned about Block 13 and its proximity to no's 73, 75, 77 and 79 Flexford Close.
  - Obscuring of view from development, may violate rights under 'Ancient Lights' laws.
  - Guidance within the Village Design Statement identifies that the roof height of development should not detract on the light and amenity of neighbouring properties.
- 6.4
- Overdevelopment.
  - Overlooking.
  - New buildings will have windows on the eastern elevation overlooking the properties in Flexford Close, resulting in a serious loss of privacy.
  - The buildings on the eastern boundary of the application site are too close to the brook, at 18-20 meters from the nearest homes in Flexford Close.
  - The combination of raised ground levels, loss of trees and positioning of the proposed buildings will invade the privacy of those living on Flexford Close.
  - Internal layout of buildings could be changed so that there is only obscure glazing on the elevations facing Monks Brook.
  - Current conifer trees serve to improve soil quality and captures CO2.
  - The original plan was to retain the trees with little clearance works.
  - Steep retaining walls are not compatible with the root protection areas of existing trees.
  - Replacement trees will not mature and provide any protection.
  - Replacement trees will be deciduous and not provide any screening during winter months.

- Independent tree survey should be undertaken.
- Proposal will dominate any Flexford Close resident in direct view, overbearing.
- Noise.
- Current tranquillity destroyed by the positioning of car parks serving the proposed buildings in close proximity to the Flexford Close residents.
- Users of the car park will be shining headlights into properties, affecting residential amenity.
- Smell.

#### 6.5 *Landscaping*

- Removal of trees will exacerbate problems and create a city-scape where it was formerly a sylvan aspect.
- Existing trees help stabilise the bank and absorb groundwater to help prevent flooding.
- Removal of trees should be carefully considered so that all healthy trees are retained.
- Removal of trees goes against TVBC's statements on climate change.
- Proposal includes planting adjacent to the Beechwood Pumping station that is not within the applicant's control.

#### 6.6 *Appearance*

- Character of the area, design.
- Proposed rooflines do not follow normal practice of being gradually compatible with surrounding roofs, roof profiles should be looked at as they are too high.
- Guidance within the village design statement states that the roof heights of development should respect those of nearby properties.
- Drainage infrastructure along Monks Brook will be an eyesore, ugly appearance of retaining walls.
- Plenty of space onsite to allow for a redesign of proposed development.

#### 6.7 Impact on protected species and habitats

##### *Onsite*

- Concerned that the development will disturb the presence of existing bats within the area.
- Due to the issues stated above, the proposal will not correspond with TVBC's environmental statement, which commits to minimising negative impact on the environment.

##### *Offsite*

- Setting and attractiveness of Flexford Nature Reserve located opposite will be degraded by the proposed development.
- Amount of construction onsite will significantly increase nitration pollution, proposal should be submitted to review by Natural England in relation to their enforcement of pollution related matters, in particular nitrogen and phosphates.



## 6.8 Other matters

### *Planning policy and history*

- Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan, NPPF, Government Advice circulars.
- Previous Planning Decisions.

### *Drainage and contamination*

- Concern about surface water drainage impact from the raised redevelopment.
- Proposed buildings at the lower part of Flexford Close adjacent to Monks Brook are within an area susceptible to flooding by water runoff, both sides of the brook are at risk and raising the ground level on one side of the brook would increase the risk of flooding.
- Concerned about the potential impact of contaminative material and the potential to enter the water course at Monks Brook.
- Contaminative material should be taken offsite and tested.
- Risk of flooding from Flexford nature reserve.
- Disturbance to wildlife following tree removal.

## 6.9 *Highways*

- Traffic Generation, Parking and Safety.

### *Infrastructure*

- Wonder whether an increase of service such as GP and dental provision funded by the local council for the area to cope with the increased demand from additional residents.

### *Construction*

- On a side note believe consideration is required for the building process, concerned about the impact of pile driving during construction on the stability of existing properties.
- Concerned that building has not stopped until issues with the current planning application have been resolved.
- Local Planning Authority should require the ground levels to be returned to the original level and serve enforcement notices to achieve this.

### *Planning officer site visit*

- Request that the planning officer visit the application site to assess impact of proposed level changes.

### *Enforcement of ground levels*

- Concerned that the ground levels have been raised without any enforcement action such as stop notices being taken by TVBC.

### *Notification of amended plans*

- Disappointed that notification letters for the amended plans received on 17<sup>th</sup> February were delayed and that only two weeks response time was given.

- The stated response time did not give enough time to cover the next available Parish Council meeting.

## 7.0 **POLICY**

### 7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### 7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) (TVBRLP)

Policy E1: High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E2: Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough

Policy E3: Local Gaps

Policy E5: Biodiversity

Policy E7: Water Management

Policy E8: Pollution

Policy LHW4: Amenity

Policy T1: Managing Movement

Policy T2: Parking Standards

### 7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Ampfield Village Design Statement (2019)

## 8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 Given outline planning permission exists for the application site which includes the means of access, the quantum of development and certain parameters, the main planning considerations are:

- Whether the proposal complies with the parameters plan approved at outline stage.
- Whether the proposal is an appropriate form of development with regard to layout, landscaping, appearance and how the proposal relates to the amenity of neighbouring properties and future residents.
- Whether the proposal would adversely impact protected species and/or habitats.

### 8.2 **Parameters Plan**

For the area of the development site under consideration, the approved parameters plan set out the following:

- Formation of entrance green in the south-west corner of the application site, adjacent to the vehicular access on Baddesley Road.
- Formation of central green area in the centre of the application site.
- Maximum storey height of 2 storeys for all buildings.
- The following minimum separation distances with neighbouring properties:

<b>Flexford Close property</b>	<b>Minimum Separation Distance</b>
No. 21	16m
No. 23	17m
No. 55	17m
No's. 69/71	40m
No's. 73/75	31m
No. 77	25m

**8.3 Entrance Green**

The submitted site layout plan demonstrates the retention of the south-west corner of the application as an area of soft landscaping, with no buildings proposed in this part of the site. The submitted soft landscaping plan details the proposed planting to be implemented as well as measures to enable its establishment and ongoing maintenance. Consequently, it is considered the proposal is in accordance with this parameter of the outline permission.

8.4 It is acknowledged that this part of the application site is subject to a separate temporary planning permission for use as a marketing suite (application reference 21/02555/FULLS, paragraph 4.1). However, condition 1 of this permission secures the removal of the suite and restoration of the land to its former condition upon the expiry of the 3 year permission. Therefore, this separate permission does not serve to prevent the delivery of the entrance green as proposed in the current reserved matters application.

**8.5 Central Green**

The submitted site layout plan demonstrates that no proposed accommodation blocks or ancillary structures will occupy the area of the application site designated as a Central Green on the parameters plan that accompanied the outline permission. As a result, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with this parameter of the outline permission.

**8.6 Storey heights**

All 17 proposed accommodation blocks comprise a maximum of two floors of living accommodation and therefore, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with this parameter of the outline permission.

**8.7 Separation distances**

With reference to the table set out in paragraph 8.2 above, the proposed site plan demonstrates the following separation distances with properties in Flexford Close :

<b>Flexford Close property</b>	<b>Minimum separation distance on parameter plan</b>	<b>Separation distance on proposed site plan</b>
No. 21	16m	18.5m
No. 23	17m	19.2m
No. 55	17m	19.6m
No's. 69/71	40m	43.6m
No's. 73/75	31m	34.6m
No. 77	25m	29.5m

- 8.8 As identified in the table above, all of the separation distances between the relevant proposed accommodation block and the nearest residential properties in Flexford Close are in excess of the minimum separation distances on the parameter plan. Therefore, the proposed development is in accordance with this parameter.
- 8.9 *Ground levels*  
It is acknowledged that the outline permission included indicative section drawings, and that the proposed ground levels for the current reserved matters proposal are higher than that shown on the section drawings provided with the outline application. However, the final ground levels did not form part of the parameters plan and were not secured by the imposition of standalone condition on the outline permission. Consequently, retaining the original ground levels do not form a requirement of the outline permission. The acceptability of the proposed ground levels is however a matter to be assessed as part of determining the current application.
- 8.10 It is acknowledged that the previously approved details for the drainage strategy, as secured by the imposition of condition no. 20 of the outline application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.7), contained drawings with annotated proposed ground levels. However, these drawings did not contain full details of the proposed layout such as building heights and were approved in the context of assessing the technical merits of the drainage strategy for the wider application. It is therefore not considered that the approval of the drainage strategy drawings serves as justification demonstrating that the layout of the current proposal is acceptable in its own right with regard to all material planning considerations. The assessment of the planning merits of the proposed layout is undertaken in the following section below.
- 8.11 Conclusion  
Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the proposed scheme complies with the requirements of the outline planning permission.
- 8.12 **Consideration of reserved matters – Layout**  
The following section sets out an assessment on the layout of the proposed scheme, beginning with consideration of the impact on the amenity of neighbouring property before progressing to the other material considerations.
- 8.13 Boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close (Blocks 6, 6A, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13)  
The north-east boundary of the application site comprises Monks Brook and the residential properties served by Flexford Close. Due to the ground levels, Monks Brook and the Flexford Close properties are topographically lower than the application site. This difference in ground level becomes more pronounced when travelling further infield towards the rear boundary (north-west) of the application site which adjoins Trodds Copse.

- 8.14 In comparison to the original ground levels of the application site as indicated by the site survey drawing that accompanied the outline permission, the submitted proposed site sections demonstrate that the proposed ground levels will typically be approximately 2m/2.5m higher for the southern section of the Monks Brook boundary, and approximately 1m higher for the northern section. The impact of the proposed raised ground levels in combination with the layout of the proposed buildings for this part of the application site is assessed below, on a building by building basis.
- 8.15 *Block 6*  
This proposed building will be positioned at the site entrance to the wider application site adjacent to the entrance green, with the nearest residential property (no. 21 Flexford Close) located approximately 38m to the north-east. As a result of this substantial separation distance, it is considered that the proposed building will not materially impact current privacy, daylight or sunlight levels for neighbouring property.
- 8.16 The orientation and positioning of the proposed building results in the internal spine road separating the proposed building with the proposed accommodation blocks to the west, with a parking court separating Block 6 and the proposed buildings to the north. It is noted that Block 6A is located in closer proximity, however the corresponding side (south) elevation that faces Block 6 only comprises windows serving secondary living areas such as internal hallways and a study. Consequently, it is considered that the layout of this proposed building is acceptable and will provide sufficient amenity to potential future occupants of the proposed development and neighbouring residential properties.
- 8.17 *Block 6A*  
The proposed accommodation building annotated as Block 6A comprises two 'cottage style' units and is in an offset position relative to the nearest neighbouring property (no. 21 Flexford Close). As a result of this offset positioning and the type of accommodation proposed, the rear (east) elevation of the proposed building will not directly face the neighbouring property and does not contain any first floor fenestration. The proposed side (north) elevation does include a ground and first floor window, but this fenestration will be positioned approximately 21m away from no. 21 Flexford Close and will not directly face the neighbouring dwelling or residential garden. Therefore, notwithstanding that the proposed building will be on higher ground than the neighbouring property, it is considered that the relative impact on neighbouring property would be acceptable.
- 8.18 *Block 7*  
The proposed building annotated as Block 7 comprises a two storey building, orientated at an angle to the boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close. The eastern projection of the proposed building will be the closest section to the neighbouring properties and as a result of the angled positioning, the fenestration at the southern end will be facing the rear boundary of the residential garden area serving this neighbouring property with a minimum separation distance of 18.5m. There are also side windows for the bay projections at the eastern end of the north elevation but these will be located a minimum of 19.5m from the side (west) elevation of no. 21 Flexford Close.

- 8.19 As a result, it is considered that the separation distance between the nearest fenestration on Block 7 and no. 21 Flexford Close, in combination with the orientation away from areas of high amenity value, will ensure that the relative impact on this neighbouring property will be acceptable, notwithstanding that the proposed building will be on higher ground.
- 8.20 *Block 8*  
Block 8 is a two storey building in a rectangular form, positioned adjacent to the driveway areas serving no.'s 21 and 23 Flexford Close as well as the intervening turning head. Consequently, whilst the rear (east) elevation of this proposed building does contain ground floor and first floor fenestration, any available views will avoid direct overlooking of residential gardens and windows present on the neighbouring properties. Therefore, it is considered that the layout and design of Block 8 will avoid any materially significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties with regard to privacy, daylight and sunlight provision.
- 8.21 *Block 9*  
Block 9 is a two storey building proposed in the centre of the boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close, orientated with the rear (east) elevation facing no. 55 Flexford Close. The northern half of the rear (east) elevation is positioned adjacent to the front driveway area serving this neighbouring property as well as the turning head for the cul-de-sac. As such, it is not considered that there will be any direct views of areas of high amenity value from this part of the proposed building.
- 8.22 The southern half of the Block 9 does contain ground and first floor fenestration directly adjacent to the corresponding side (west) elevation of no. 55 Flexford Close, with a minimum separation distance of 16.5m away from the boundary and 20.5m to the elevation of the neighbouring dwellinghouse. It is noted that the design of the proposed building has been amended to include privacy screens for the balconies at the southern end of the side (east) elevation. As a result, any unobstructed views are limited to the windows directly adjacent to the side elevation of the neighbouring dwellinghouse rather than the rear residential garden area.
- 8.23 On balance, it is considered that the minimum separation distances in combination with the layout of the proposed building relative to the neighbouring property, is sufficient to offset the higher ground level of the proposed development.
- 8.24 *Block 11*  
Block 11 is a two storey linear building orientated with the side (east) elevation to the boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close, positioned directly opposite the corresponding side elevation of the neighbouring property no. 57 Flexford Close. Following an amendment to the design of this proposed building, the two windows in the side (east) elevation of Block 11 will be fitted with frosted glass to prevent any direct views of the neighbouring property. In addition, there are two side (east) windows for the bay projection on the south elevation of the proposed building but due to their placement in relation to no. 57 Flexford Close, any views will be limited to the driveway area of the neighbouring property.

- 8.25 Therefore, it is considered that the design of the proposed building in conjunction with the separation distance will ensure that notwithstanding the change in ground levels, there will be no materially significant harm to the amenity and living conditions of no. 57 Flexford Close.
- 8.26 *Block 12*  
The proposed building annotated as Block 12 on the submitted drawings is also a two storey linear building orientated with the side (east) elevation facing the boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close. The proposed building will be positioned opposite the end section of the residential garden area serving no. 57 Flexford Close. Following the amendments undertaken, the proposed windows at the southern end of the elevation will be fitted with frosted glass to prevent clear views of the neighbouring properties. As a result, there are no windows directly facing Flexford Close with the exception of the side windows for the bay projections on the north elevation. These windows will be positioned opposite the rear boundary of the residential garden area serving no. 57 Flexford Close with a minimum separation distance of approximately 23m.
- 8.27 As a result, it is considered that notwithstanding the proposed change in ground levels, the proposed design and placement of the fenestration on Block 12 in combination with the separation distance to no. 57 Flexford Close, will ensure that the proposed building does not result in any materially significant loss of privacy or daylight and sunlight provision.
- 8.28 *Block 13*  
Block 13 comprises 3 'cottage style' units in a linear, terrace arrangement located in the north-east corner of the application site. As a result of this positioning, the proposed building will be directly opposite the rear elevations of no's. 73, 75, 77 and 79 Flexford Close and it is acknowledged that the proposed development will be on a significantly higher ground level than that of the neighbouring properties.
- 8.29 However, there will be a minimum separation distance between the rear elevation of the proposed units and the corresponding elevations of no's 73 and 75 Flexford Close of 34m and 24m between the proposed units and the rear elevations of no's. 77 and 79 Flexford Close. In addition, the 'cottage style' design of the proposed units comprise only ground level fenestration on the rear elevation, with direct views screened by the proposed hedgerow to be planted in close proximity and the proposed replacement trees to be planted in the Monk's Brook embankment. As a result, it is considered that the relative impact of Block 13 on neighbouring property will be acceptable with regard to privacy, daylight and sunlight provision.
- 8.30 Replacement tree planting  
In addition to the separation distances and design of the proposed buildings as identified above, it is noted that the proposed replacement tree planting along Monks Brook will also provide a degree of screening that will further reduce the potential for any overlooking of the Flexford Close properties. A further assessment of the landscape impact of the proposed replacement planting is undertaken below.

- 8.31 Boundary with King Edwards Park (Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5)  
For the south-east section of the application site the proposed site plan demonstrates there will be 5 separate buildings, with 4 arranged around a central courtyard and a set of smaller cottage style units (Block 1) located at the front (south) of the application site facing Baddesley Road.
- 8.32 The submitted section drawing for this part of the application site demonstrates that the ground level is significantly lower than that of the adjoining Wheelhouse Park. As a result, the ground floor fenestration present on the two nearest proposed buildings (Blocks 2 and 4) will be screened by the embankment on the boundary of the application site, with only the first floor windows and balconies of the proposed buildings likely to be visible from the neighbouring units within Wheelhouse Park. Typically the units within Wheelhouse Park are laid out so that the parking areas occupy the nearest part of the individual plots facing the application site.
- 8.33 The intervening distance between the first floor fenestration of Blocks 2 and 4 with the nearest caravan units varies significantly but the shortest intervening distance will be approximately 13.5m. It is considered that this separation distance is sufficient to prevent any significant mutual overlooking with the resulting relationship similar to that between residential dwellings facing each other on opposite sides of a road. Furthermore, the separation distance with the units positioned within Wheelhouse Park will also ensure that there is not any materially significant impact on daylight or sunlight for the existing residential units.
- 8.34 Boundary with Trodds Copse (Blocks 14, 14A, 17 and 19)  
The proposed buildings to be located adjacent to Trodds Copse will be separated from neighbouring properties, by the other proposed development and the previously approved Village Centre building. It is therefore considered that there will be no material impact arising from this part of the proposed scheme and the residential amenity of neighbouring property.
- 8.35 Impact on potential future occupants  
It is considered the proposed layout retains sufficient separation distances between the areas of high amenity for each individual unit to ensure that an acceptable level of amenity for potential future occupants will be achieved.
- 8.36 Parking provision  
Annexe G of the TVBRLP sets out a minimum parking standard for supported accommodation as 1 space per unit of accommodation provided. In addition, the minimum parking standards also include a standard of 1 space designated as visitors parking for every 5 units of accommodation. For the 91 units included within the current proposal (as summarised in the table set out at paragraph 3.2) this would trigger the requirement for 109 spaces to serve the proposed living accommodation.



- 8.37 In support of the application, a highways technical note has been provided highlighting the vehicle ownership rates for occupants at other supported accommodation sites located outside the Borough, this information was submitted in support of the previous reserved matters application (reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.4). The data from the other existing sites identified vehicle ownership rates for residents equated to 0.75 spaces per unit. Given that these other sites comprise the same type of accommodation as currently proposed, it is considered that the data submitted represents sufficient justification to depart from the standard within Annexe G of the TVBRLP.
- 8.38 Applying the vehicle ownership rate of 0.75 per unit to the current proposal, a total of 68 spaces in addition to 18 spaces for visitor parking is required. A total of 86 spaces have been included within the current proposal with no objection raised by the Highways officer to the parking layout proposed and availability of manoeuvring space onsite.
- 8.39 Refuse Provision  
In support of the proposal a refuse strategy for the proposed accommodation has been submitted demonstrating the provision of onsite bin stores, and the identification of individual collection points along the main internal spine road for each proposed building.
- 8.40 It is acknowledged that in response to the submitted strategy, the Refuse Officer has raised concerns in relation to the number of collection points proposed and the approach to provide smaller individual bins rather than larger, communal bins. Both of these concerns relate to the potential impact on the time taken for refuse collection.
- 8.41 Whilst these concerns are noted it is considered that a residential development of this scale will inevitably require a reasonable period of time for refuse collection, and the submitted strategy does secure the placement of bins along the main internal spine road during collection days by care staff. As a result the refuse vehicle will not need to access any of the subsidiary parking areas, with onsite manoeuvring limited to travelling along the spine road and performing one turning manoeuvre.
- 8.42 Therefore, whilst the number of bins presented for collection does not qualify as the most efficient arrangement, the commitment for onsite care staff to present the bins for collection along the main internal spine road will offset any inconvenience caused. To ensure that this commitment is delivered, a condition has been imposed securing the implementation of the proposed refuse strategy. In addition, the refuse strategy has been updated to demonstrate that the proposed facilities will be able to accommodate the anticipated food waste collection service. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed refuse strategy is acceptable.

8.43 Conclusion on layout

Following the assessment undertaken above it is considered that the proposed layout will, on balance, avoid any materially significant loss of residential amenity in relation to privacy, daylight and sunlight provision for neighbouring property. In addition, it is considered that the proposed layout will deliver an acceptable level of residential amenity for potential future occupants. Consequently, the application is in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.

8.44 Furthermore, the proposed layout will ensure that sufficient onsite parking capacity and refuse provision is provided to avoid any adverse impact on the highway safety of the local road network. As a result, the application is in accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of the TVBRLP.

8.45 **Landscaping**

In support of the proposal a landscape masterplan and strategy has been submitted detailing the proposed landscape areas and the type of vegetation to be planted (native hedgerow, ornamental shrubs etc) throughout the proposed development. This strategy also includes the removal of the existing tree belt along the Monks Brook boundary to be replaced by a mix of Crack Willow, Alder, Wild Service Tree, Holly, Yew, Oak and Lime with the final mix and size of planting secured through the imposition of a condition.

8.46 As demonstrated by the commentary within the officer report produced for the outline planning permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS, the existing tree belt along Monks Brook was previously identified to be progressively removed, with paragraph 8.58 of the May 2018 report stating as follows:

*Impact on Flexford Close*

*The houses in Flexford Close are separated from the site by Monks Brook. The application proposes to include an 8 metre river maintenance buffer between the boundary with Flexford Close and any built development. The boundary between the Flexford Close and the site consists of tall conifer/pine/cypress trees. These currently screen the site from the residents of Flexford Close. It is proposed to progressively remove these trees once new planting has been established. The indicative landscape proposals submitted with the application show that a screen along Monks Brook between the site and the dwellings at Flexford Close would be retained however, further details of this would be included with any reserved matters submission.*

8.47 It is acknowledged that the proposed replacement tree planting to be located along the Monks Brook boundary is unlikely to provide the same extent of coverage as the existing tree belt. However, it is not considered necessary in landscape terms for the proposed replacement planting to achieve the same extent of coverage as the existing trees, which served to provide a complete screen between Flexford Close and the previous industrial use of the application site. Although there will be a reduction in coverage, the proposed replacement planting will result in a tree lined boundary and backdrop for the proposed development whilst improving the mix and range of tree species. In combination

with the retained Oak trees in the centre of the application site and additional planting proposed throughout the whole development, it is considered the proposed scheme will achieve a verdant aesthetic that characterises the settlement area. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will avoid a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area.

- 8.48 It is noted that the Tree and Landscape officer have raised concerns regarding the establishment of the proposed replacement tree planting, notwithstanding the details within the submitted landscape strategy. To resolve this matter a condition has been imposed to secure the submission of the specific species mix along Monks Brook and composition of tree pits/soil volumes for all proposed tree planting. With this detail secured and subsequent further input from the Landscape and Tree officers, it is considered that the establishment of the proposed planting will be achieved. A request has also been made for a services plan, but given the drainage plan has already been provided and that other services will follow the route of the internal road layout, then it is not considered that the submission of this detail is necessary to make the proposed development acceptable.
- 8.49 Third party representations have referenced the inclusion of vegetation around the Pumping station adjacent to the south-east corner of the application site on the submitted drawings, but this is only shown for indicative purposes. As such, this vegetation has not formed part of the assessment of the proposed landscape strategy.
- 8.50 Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the proposed landscaping scheme is acceptable and in accordance with Policy E2 of the TVBRLP.
- 8.51 Local Gap  
The application is located within the Ampfield-Chandlers Ford/Valley Park Local Gap as designated by Policy E3 of the TVBRLP. In assessing the acceptability of redeveloping the application site at the outline planning stage, it was concluded that the appearance of the structures and paraphernalia associated with the previous industrial and storage use, enabled the site to be redeveloped without further diminishing the integrity and appearance of the Local Gap. As part of achieving this objective, it was identified that any future redevelopment of the application site should incorporate landscaped boundaries with buildings set back from Baddesley Road, to ensure that the appearance of development was contained and a rural character maintained. As set out above, the proposed scheme is considered to deliver these objectives through compliance with the parameters plan and the implementation of an acceptable landscape strategy. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal will avoid any material harm to the Ampfield-Chandlers Ford/Valley Park Local Gap and the application is in accordance with Policy E3 of the TVBRLP.

**8.52 Appearance**

The design, form and external materials for the proposed development follows the approach adopted for the previous reserved matters parcel (application reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.4). This approach comprises a traditional design with the proposed buildings characterised by pitched roof forms split up into varying ridge heights and a mixture of external materials featuring red brickwork, vertical clay hanging tiles, timber panelling and render panels. These materials are characteristic of the residential properties in the locality, as identified in the Ampfield Village Design statement.

8.53 When viewing the application site from Baddesley Road to the south, the appearance of the proposed development will be softened by the presence of the entrance green and mature planting at the front of the application site. As set by the parameters plan that accompanied the outline planning permission, there will be a clear hierarchy in scale of the proposed buildings throughout the whole development with smaller units at the front of the application site leading to the main Village Centre building towards the rear. Consequently, it is considered that the appearance of the proposed scheme when viewed from Baddesley Road will complement and respect the settlement character of the area.

8.54 In relation to the impact on views available from Flexford Close, third party representations have raised concern in relation to the height of the proposed buildings appearing visually at odds with the neighbouring properties, in addition to the harm arising from the appearance of drainage infrastructure within the Monks Brook embankment. However, it is considered that the height and appearance of the proposed development is an inevitable outcome of the difference in ground levels, rather than a flaw in the proposed design.

8.55 With regard to the appearance of the proposed development from views within the application site, the proposed buildings are typically orientated to address the main internal spine road and comprise a mixture and variety of features within the same palette of external materials. As a result, it is considered the appearance of the current proposal will fit with the design of the previously approved reserved matters parcel (application reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.4). Notwithstanding the approval of external materials as part of the previous reserved matters approval, a condition has been imposed to secure the final specification of external materials to account for potential supply issues with particular manufacturers.

8.56 Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the appearance of the proposed development will complement and respect with the settlement character of the area. As a result, the application is in accordance with Policy E1 of the TVBRLP.

**8.57 Protected Species and Habitats**

Onsite biodiversity

Third party representations have raised concern that the proposed scheme will result in an adverse impact on protected species and habitats with particular reference to the removal of the existing trees on the Monks Brook boundary.

However, as explained in the preceding section titled 'Landscaping', the trees were previously identified for removal as part of the outline planning permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS and are to be replaced with trees of a wider species mix than currently present onsite whilst retaining this important wildlife corridor.

- 8.58 Furthermore, the proposed designated Entrance and Central Green areas and additional landscape planting throughout the proposed development will result a net increase in onsite vegetation, when compared to the previous industrial and storage use of the application site. Consequently, it is considered that the redevelopment of the wider application site for care accommodation will as a whole sufficiently offset the ecological value of the existing trees.
- 8.59 Conditions were imposed on the previous outline planning permission to ensure there is no material harm on the designated Trodds Copse site that borders the application site to the rear, as well as ensuring that external lighting is of appropriate specification with to regard to the potential presence of bats. These controls also apply to the current proposal and as such, it is considered that there will be no significant material harm arising from either the construction or occupation phase. Concerns have also been raised in third party representation letters to the impact on Flexford Nature Reserve on the opposite side of Baddesley Road, but given the separation distance and type of development proposed it is not considered that the proposal will result in any material harm to the Nature Reserve. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed scheme will protect and conserve onsite biodiversity and the ecological value of neighbouring sites.
- 8.60 Offsite biodiversity: Nutrient Neutrality  
Since the determination of the outline planning permission, Natural England have advised that there are high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus input to the water environment of the Solent region caused by wastewater from existing housing and from agricultural sources and that these nutrients are causing eutrophication at the designated nature conservation sites which includes the Solent Water SPA. This results in dense mats of green algae that are impacting on the Solent's protected habitats and bird species.
- 8.61 Natural England further advises that there is uncertainty as to whether new housing growth will further deteriorate designated sites. Work on this issue is on-going with the local planning authorities, the Environment Agency and the water companies. That may lead to identified mitigation measures in the future.
- 8.62 In the meantime, Natural England advises that one way to address the uncertainty is to achieve nutrient neutrality whereby an individual scheme would not add to nutrient burdens. In this instance, a nutrient budget calculation was undertaken to identify the total additional nitrate output of the proposed development subject to the current reserved matters application.

- 8.63 The calculation undertaken is reliant on the use of an average 1.35 occupancy rate instead of the Natural England standard methodology rate of 2.4. To justify this total, evidence of the occupancy rates for other existing care villages within the applicant's control was provided for review on the previous reserved matters application reference 20/00488/RESS (paragraph 4.4), identifying an average occupancy rate of 1.4 for this type of accommodation across the industry. This data demonstrated that the occupancy rate of 1.35 was an accurate reflection for the type of accommodation proposed, with the legal agreement completed at outline planning permission stage limiting occupancy to those receiving a minimum care package of 1.5 hours per week. Consequently, it is considered that the use of 1.35 as an alternative occupancy rate is acceptable and in accordance with the principles the appropriate assessment undertaken for the previous reserved matters approval issued under application reference 20/00488/RESS (paragraph 4.4). Natural England previously responded to this appropriate assessment raising no objection.
- 8.64 The budget calculation undertaken is also informed by the predominantly industrial historic land uses as identified by the previous lawful development certificate issued under application reference 16/01889/CLES (paragraph 4.10). Given that the historic land uses have been subject to formal assessment for the issuing of the lawful development certificate, it is considered that this approach is sufficiently robust and precautionary.
- 8.65 As a result of the inputs for population and land use, the budget calculation identifies that the proposed development will result in an additional nutrient generation of 178.7 kg/TN/yr. To offset this impact on the designated Solent sites, it is proposed to purchase credits from the strategic mitigation scheme administered by Eastleigh Borough Council.
- 8.66 This strategic mitigation scheme comprises the cessation of agricultural uses of over 238 hectares of land predominantly located at sites in Bishopstoke, West End, Botley and Fair Oak. Through direct purchase, Eastleigh Borough Council are able to ensure that the previous agricultural activity and the associated generation of nutrients is prevented. This reduction in nutrients entering the designated Solent sites is subsequently offered to developers as credits to offset the impact arising from development.
- 8.67 This principle of removing land from agricultural use to generate a reduction in nutrients entering the designated Solent sites is the same basis underpinning TVBC's strategic mitigation scheme at Roke Manor Farm in Awbridge. Although the strategic mitigation scheme administered by Eastleigh Borough Council is located in a different borough to the application site, the mitigation applies to the same river catchment areas. As a result, the offsetting of agricultural land will still benefit the same designated ecology sites impacted by the proposed development.
- 8.68 To ensure that strategic mitigation schemes are robustly, delivered, monitored and where appropriate subject to any necessary enforcement measures, legal agreements are usually entered into with developers and land owners. Where mitigation is cross-boundary the co-operation of neighbouring local authorities is required.

- 8.69 In order to allow TVBC to engage in cross-boundary agreements, Section 33 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 provides the opportunity for neighbouring Councils to agree to ascribe powers of Enforcement to other Councils who may request such powers in relation to monitoring of strategic mitigation schemes. Under section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 a Local Authority may arrange for the discharge of any of their functions by another Local Authority. A draft section 33 agreement between Eastleigh Borough Council and TVBC has been issued for signing and will be completed shortly, to enable the monitoring and enforcement of the proposed nutrient mitigation scheme to be undertaken by Eastleigh Borough Council.
- 8.70 Therefore, subject to the developer demonstrating that sufficient mitigation credits have been secured from Eastleigh Borough Council which is typically demonstrated through the obtainment of a vesting certificate, then it is considered that the proposed mitigation measures are sufficiently robust. This conclusion is subject to confirmation Natural England that have no objections through the completion of an Appropriate Assessment.
- 8.71 Offsite biodiversity: Phosphate Neutrality  
As referred to in the preceding section, Natural England have advise that there are high levels of nitrogen and phosphorous input into Solent designated sites. In this instance, the application site is located on land where additional phosphate as well as nutrient generation can lead to harm to protected species and habitats. Consequently, it is necessary for the proposed development to demonstrate phosphate neutrality as well as nutrient neutrality.
- 8.72 Based on the same principles outlined in relation to nutrient neutrality, the same additional population input has been used to calculate a phosphate budget for the proposed development using Natural England's standard methodology. This calculation identifies that the proposed development will generate an additional 3.49 kg/yr of phosphates.
- 8.73 To offset the potential additional phosphate loading, it is proposed to again purchase credits from the strategic mitigation scheme administered by Eastleigh Borough Council. In the same manner that the cessation of previous agricultural activity on land purchased by Eastleigh Borough Council will result in a decrease in nutrient, there is also a reduction in phosphate loading albeit to a lesser extent.
- 8.74 Although a section 33 agreement has yet to be completed between TVBC and Eastleigh Borough Council, a draft agreement has been formulated on the same principles as that adopted for the section 33 agreement for the nutrient mitigation scheme. Therefore, subject to Natural England review of an Appropriate Assessment and the developer submitting evidence of the purchase of sufficient credits, it is considered that the additional phosphate loading will be mitigated.

8.75 Conclusion on protected species and habitats

Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the proposed development will avoid any material harm to protected species and habitats onsite in addition to protecting offsite designated ecology sites. As a result, the application is in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

8.76 **Other Matters**

In addition to the material considerations assessed above, a number of other matters have been raised in the representations received and brief comments on these issues are set out below.

8.77 Planning Policy

A number of third party representations have made general reference to national and local planning policy documents such as the NPPF and the policies of the TVBRLP. For the rationale set out above, it is considered that the proposal is compliant with both national and local planning policy.

8.78 Planning History

Concern has also been expressed in regard to previous planning decisions, however every application is assessed on its own merits. As set out above, it is considered that the proposed scheme is both consistent with the outline permission granted under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.7) and acceptable when assessed against relevant planning policy.

8.79 Drainage and Contamination

Third party representations have raised concern in relation to the impact of the proposed development on surface water drainage and contamination in the context of the adjoining Monks Brook. However, these matters are subject to the separate assessed secured by the imposition of conditions imposed on the outline planning permission reference 17/01615/OUTS (conditions no. 18 and 19 – management of contaminative material and condition no. 20 – surface water drainage strategy).

8.80 Construction

Submitted comments have referenced the potential impact of the associated construction process on residential amenity and the local amenity of the area. Due to the scale of development proposed it is inevitable that there will be a degree of disturbance. However in the event that permission is granted for the current proposal, the associated construction methods will be subject to the approved construction plan that forms part of the outline planning permission reference 17/01615/OUTS (condition no. 6 – construction traffic movements and condition no. 13 – working hours) in addition to controls available to the Local Authority under other legislation. This matter does therefore not form a reasonable basis for refusing the current application.

8.81 In relation to those concerns raised in respect of the potential stability of buildings following the undertaking of ground works, this is a matter covered by Building Regulations.



8.82 Highways

Submitted representations have referred to the potential impact on the highway safety of the local road network arising from the increase in vehicle movements generated by the proposed development. However, this matter has already been assessed as part of the outline permission in addition to the location of the proposed access point onto Baddesley Road. Consequently, the assessment of highway matters is limited to the internal arrangement of access roads and the arrangement and capacity of onsite parking provision.

8.83 Infrastructure

Third party representations have referenced the potential impact of the proposed scheme on infrastructure provision such as GP and dentist facilities. The impact of the proposed development on local infrastructure and community facilities was assessed as part of the outline application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.7) and it is therefore not necessary to assess this matter again.

8.84 Planning officer site visits

Third party representations have requested the undertaking of site visits by the case officer to assess the impact of the proposed development. It is confirmed that the case officer has visited Flexford Close on multiple occasions during the course of the application.

8.85 Enforcement

Concern has been raised that the raising of ground levels at the application site has not been subject to enforcement action, however this is a separate matter to the assessment of the planning application.

8.86 Notification of amended plans

In addition, concern has been raised in relation to the period of time between the receipt of the latest set of amended plans and the issuing of notification letters to the Parish Council and third parties. In response to this concern, it is confirmed all Parish Council and third party comments received at the time of writing to the latest set of amended plans have been recorded and considered.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 Outline planning permission has been granted at this site for residential development, with this reserved matters submission seeking to provide an acceptable form of development with respect to layout, appearance and landscape. Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the proposed scheme is an acceptable form of development for reserved matters approval.

9.2 This recommendation is subject to the receipt of a satisfactory consultation response from Natural England to an appropriate assessment detailing the proposed mitigation measures for designated ecology sites, as well as the submission of evidence demonstrating that sufficient nutrient and phosphate neutrality mitigation measures have been secured from Eastleigh Borough Council.

9.3 Once these steps have been completed, it is recommended that the application is approved.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

**Delegate to Head of Planning and Building to secure:**

- **Receipt of a satisfactory consultation reply from Natural England.**
- **Submission of evidence that sufficient mitigation measures have been secured to enable the development to achieve nutrient neutrality.**
- **Submission of evidence that sufficient mitigation measures have been secured to enable the development to achieve phosphate neutrality.**

**Then APPROVAL subject to:**

1. **The development is to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as follows:**
  - Site Location Plan (2496-URB-CF-00-DR-A-208900 P01)**
  - Proposed Site Layout Plan (2496-URB-CF-00-DR-A-208150 P03)**
  - Proposed Site Sections (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208350 P01)**
  - Proposed Site Sections – Wheelhouse Park (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-A-208351-P00)**
  - Block 1 Proposed Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-B01-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P02)**
  - Block 2 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B02-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P01)**
  - Block 2 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B02-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P01)**
  - Block 3 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B03-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P01)**
  - Block 3 Proposed Roof Plan (2496-URB-B03-ZZ-DR-A-208151-P01)**
  - Block 3 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B03-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P01)**
  - Block 4 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B04-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P02)**
  - Block 4 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B04-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P02)**
  - Block 5 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B05-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P01)**
  - Block 5 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B05-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P01)**
  - Block 6A Proposed Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-B06A-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P01)**
  - Block 6 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B06-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P02)**
  - Block 6 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B06-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P02)**
  - Block 7 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B07-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P01)**
  - Block 7 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B07-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P01)**
  - Block 8 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B08-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P04)**
  - Block 8 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B08-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P04)**
  - Block 9 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B09-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P03)**
  - Block 9 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B09-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P03)**
  - Block 11 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B11-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P02)**
  - Block 11 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B11-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P02)**
  - Block 12 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B12-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P02)**
  - Block 12 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B12-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P02)**
  - Block 13 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B13-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P00)**
  - Block 13 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B13-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P00)**
  - Block 14A Proposed Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-B14A-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P00)**
  - Block 14 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B14-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P02)**

**Block 14 Proposed Roof Plan (2496-URB-B14-ZZ-DR-A-208151-P01)**  
**Block 14 Proposed Elevations Sheet 1 of 2 (2496-URB-B14-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P02)**  
**Block 14 Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 of 2 (2496-URB-B14-ZZ-DR-A-208251-P01)**  
**Block 17 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B17-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P01)**  
**Block 17 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B17-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P01)**  
**Block 19 Proposed Plans (2496-URB-B19-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P01)**  
**Block 19 Proposed Elevations (2496-URB-B19-ZZ-DR-A-208250-P01)**  
**Proposed Bin Store Type 1 (2496-URB-BS-ZZ-DR-A-208150-P02)**  
**Proposed Bin Store Type 2 (2496-URB-BS-ZZ-DR-A-208151-P01)**  
**Proposed Bin Store Type 3 (2496-URB-BS-ZZ-DR-A-208152-P01)**  
**Proposed Refuse Strategy (2496-URB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-206900-P01)**  
**Proposed Entrance Wall Sheet 1 of 2 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208550 P00)**  
**Proposed Entrance Wall Sheet 2 of 2 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208551 P00)**  
**Proposed Landscape Masterplan (2496-URB-CF-Z-DR-L-208151-P01)**  
**Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 1 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208910-P03)**  
**Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 2 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208911-P04)**  
**Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 3 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208912-P05)**  
**Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 4 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208913-P05)**

- 2. Landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscape plans and documents:  
Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Rev C)  
Proposed Landscape Masterplan (2496-URB-CF-Z-DR-L-208151-P01)  
Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 1 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208910-P03)  
Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 2 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208911-P04)  
Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 3 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208912-P05)  
Proposed Landscape Strategy Sheet 4 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208913-P05)  
Landscape Management Plan (2496-URB-CF-00-SP-L-2A6652-P00)  
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 Policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 3. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To ensure the development would integrate, respect and complement the character of the area in accordance with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

- 4. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved landscape plans, no new tree planting shall take place until an updated species mix for the planting along the Monks Brook boundary and tree pit detail for each species has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.**

**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 Policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

- 5. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, a plan showing the layout and position of the designated visitor parking spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the designated visitor parking spaces shall be reserved for this purpose at all times.**

**Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

- 6. The proposed buildings annotated as Blocks 9, 11 and 12 shall not be occupied until the obscure glazed windows and privacy screens as shown on the approved plans are installed. Thereafter, the obscure glazed windows and privacy screens shall be retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

- 7. The development shall not be occupied until space has been laid out and provided for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles to enable them to enter and leave the site in a forward gear in accordance with the approved plans and this space shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.**


**Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

- 8. The movement and management of refuse bins shall be undertaken in accordance with the strategy set out on the approved drawing titled 'Overall Site Layout Plan as proposed' reference (2496-URB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-206900-P01), for the lifetime of the development hereby approved.**

**Reason: To achieve the safe and efficient manoeuvring of refuse vehicles onsite in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

**Note 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.**
-



**Siteplan**



REPRODUCED FROM ORDNANCE SURVEY MAPPING  
 WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF  
 HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICER © CROWN COPYRIGHT.  
 UNAUTHORISED REPRODUCTION INFRINGES CROWN COPYRIGHT  
 AND MAY LEAD TO PROSECUTION OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS.

**21/02697/RESS**



Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.

UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
 One Scotgate Meads, Scotgate,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
 Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360


**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**

**LEGEND:**

- APPLICATION SITE BOUNDARY FOR RESERVED MATTERS OF THE DEVELOPMENT APPROVED UNDER REF. 20/0488/RES FOR PHASE 2 & 3
- LAND SUBJECT TO PERSONAL OF RESERVED MATTERS UNDER REF. 20/0488/RES FOR PHASE 1 OF THE DEVELOPMENT APPROVED UNDER OUTLINE PERMISSION REF. 17/01615/01/5

**NOTE:**  
 ALL SITE CONSTRAINTS INDICATED ARE SUBJECT TO DETAILED SITE SURVEYS.  
 THE SITE BOUNDARY (RED LINE) IS BASED ON SURVEY DRAWINGS RECEIVED FROM THIRD PARTIES:  
 - HAMPSHIRE LAND SURVEYS LTD. SITE SURVEY EXISTING DRG.  
 - LANDRAG SOLUTIONS TREE SURVEY & CONSTRAINTS PLAN, DRG No. '01' DATED 04/11/2019.  
 Ordnance Survey (© Crown Copyright 2017. All rights reserved. Licence number 100024232)

Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023



Rev No.	Description	Drawn By	Date
P01	REVISED PLANNING ISSUE FOLLOWING SCHEME REDIGN	DH	27.06.22
P00	ISSUED FOR PLANNING	DH	07.09.21

**URBANEDGE**  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Client  
**SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LIMITED**

Project  
**CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASE 2 & 3**

Drawing  
**SITE LAYOUT PLAN AS EXISTING**

Planning	Issue	Number	Date	Author
2496	1:500 @ A1	AUG 21	TB	P01

2496-URB-CF-00-DR-A-208100



Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.


UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
 One Scogdale Meads, Scogdale,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
 Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**

- LEGEND:**
- APPLICATION SITE BOUNDARY FOR RESERVED MATTERS OF THE DEVELOPMENT (RED LINE)
  - APPROVED LAND SUBJECT TO RESERVED MATTERS UNDER REF. 20/00488/PRESS FOR PHASE 1 OF THE DEVELOPMENT APPROVED UNDER OUTLINE PERMISSION REF. 17/01615/01/5
  - EXTENT OF VILLAGE GREEN PARAMETER

**NOTE:**  
 ALL SITE CONSTRAINTS INDICATED ARE SUBJECT TO DETAILED SITE SURVEYS.  
 THE SITE BOUNDARY (RED LINE) IS DEPICTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES Laid OUT IN THE LAND REGISTRY PLANS, PRACTICE CODE 40, SUPPLEMENT 5.  
 THE OUTSIDE EDGE OF THE RED LINES DENOTE THE EXTENT OF THE SITE BOUNDARY. THE THICKNESS IS FOR GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION ONLY.  
 NOTE: INFORMATION SHOWN IS BASED ON SURVEY DRAWINGS RECEIVED FROM THIRD PARTIES:  
 - HAMPSHIRE LAND SURVEYS LTD. SITE SURVEY EXISTING DRG;  
 - LANDRAG SOLUTIONS TREE SURVEY & CONSTRAINTS PLAN.  
 DRG Nos. 01 DATED 04/11/2019.  
 Ordnance Survey (c) Crown Copyright 2017. All rights reserved. Licence number 10002432

Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023



TO FLEKORD NATURE RESERVE

P03	ADDED LANDSCAPING INFORMATION	DM	11.11.22
P02	REFUSE STORES UPDATED, 2ND BIN	DH	13.10.22
P01	STORES REMOVED, ISSUE FOLLOWING SCHEME REVISION	DH	01.07.22
P00	ISSUED FOR PLANNING	DH	07.09.21



Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LIMITED


Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASE 2 & 3

Drawing: OVERALL SITE LAYOUT PLAN AS PROPOSED

PLANNING

Reference	2496	Issue	AUG 21	Author	TB	Checker	P03
Scale	1:500 @ A1	Date		Drawn		Checked	

2496-URB-CF-00-DR-A-208150







**Legend**

1. **Entrance green** - Seeded grass area with new native tree planting, new legacy trees, retention of existing boundary trees and new entrance feature with ornamental shrubs
2. **Activity lawn** - Formal lawn for informal recreation and activities, banked to one side including a legacy tree
3. **Gardening club** - Raised allotment beds with seating, fruit trees and a shed
4. **Central green** - Retained existing Oak trees complemented with new tree planting. Existing tarmac removed and area topsoiled to create a long grass meadow
5. **Monks Brook corridor** - Existing trees removed and replaced with new, native tree planting. Beneath the trees will be swathes of native shrubs within a wildflower meadow
6. **Oak tree gardens** - Formal lawns with ornamental planting and seating focused on a legacy tree
7. **Ecological buffer** - A continuous green corridor along the stream and woodland edge consisting of a wildflower meadow with native shrub and tree planting and incorporating a new pond

**2496 - AMPFIELD MEADOWS, CHANDLER'S FORD - PHASES 2 & 3**

REVISED SCHEME - PROPOSED MASTERPLAN

PROJECT-ORGANISATION-VOLUME/SYSTEM-LEVEL-LOCATION-TYPE-ROLE-NUMBER\_REVISION


2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208151\_P01

NTS @ A3


NOVEMBER 2022

**URBANEDGE**  
architecture / landscape / masterplanning







SECTION A-A




SECTION B-B SECTION THRU LANDSCAPE AREA BETWEEN BLOCKS 11 & 12




SECTION C-C



SECTION D-D



SECTION E-E



# 2496 - AMPFIELD MEADOWS, CHANDLER'S FORD - PHASES 2 & 3

SECTIONS THROUGH MONKS BROOK LANDSCAPE CORRIDOR

PROJECT ORGANISATION: VOLUME SYSTEM LEVEL LOCATION TYPE: ROLE NUMBER, REVISION  
 2496-URB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-203350\_P01  
 NTS @ A1  
 JAN 2023

**URBANEDGE**  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning




Copyright of this drawing is the property of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited.

UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
 One Scogate Mews, Scogate,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
 UK  
 Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**



Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

URBANEDGE  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD

Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3

Block: BLOCK 06

Ground: GROUND, FIRST FLOOR & ROOF PLAN AS PROPOSED

PLANNING  
 Date: 24/09/21  
 Drawn: JA  
 Status: P02



2496-URB-B06-00-DR-A-208150



GROUND FLOOR PLAN



FIRST FLOOR PLAN




ROOF PLAN





EAST ELEVATION



SOUTH ELEVATION


WEST ELEVATION

MATERIAL KEY


B1	FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTI-BRICK
B2	PREFABRICATED CHIMNEY STACKS WITH GLAY POT - FACED WITH B BRICK
B3	PLUMB BRICK - TO MATCH B BRICK
B4	FEATURE SOLDIER COURSE TO WINDOW - B1 BRICK
C1	FIBRE CEMENT TIMBER EFFECT BOARD - LAPPED - COLOUR: GREY BROWN
D1	FIBRE CEMENT BARGEBOARDS, SOFFITS AND FASCAS - COLOUR: GREY
E1	FLAT ROOF DORMER
F1	LEAD FLASHING
H1	HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH T1
H2	HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH T2
M1	MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH T1
M2	MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH T2
P1	UPVC DRAINAGE GOODS - ROUND - OUR BLACK
R2	THROUGH COLOUR RENDER - FLINT STONE CONSERVATION STYLE ROOFLIGHTS - FINE VENTS TO COMMON AREAS - COLOUR: BLACK
S2	ROOF TILE - IMBELY ACME SINGLE CLAY FLAT TILES - RED SMOOTH
T1	ROOF TILE - IMBELY ACME SINGLE CLAY FLAT TILES - RED SMOOTH
T2	ROOF TILE - IMBELY ACME SINGLE CLAY FLAT TILES - RED SMOOTH
T3	VERTICAL HANGING TILE - AS T1
U2	BALCONY WITH BALUSTRADE - BLACK AL RAILINGS
W1	UPVC MECHANICAL JOINT FLUSH CASH WINDOW - COLOUR: WHITE/ASH
W2	PPG ALUMINIUM GLAZED ENTRANCE DOORS - COLOUR: OFF WHITE
Y3	COMPOSITE ENTRANCE DOOR (VARIOUS COLOURS)
RH	ROOF ACCESS HATCH
PV	INDICATIVE PHOTOVOLTAIC PANEL





WEST ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATION




NORTH ELEVATION



SECTION A-A



SECTION B-B



**URBANEDGE**  
architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
From: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3  
Block: BLOCK 06  
Elevations & Sections AS PROPOSED

Approved: 2496  
Date: SEPT 21  
Status: P02  
Project: 2496-URB-B06-ZZ-DR-A-208250





Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.


UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
One Scogdale Mews, Scogdale,  
Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX.  
Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**


**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**




**SOUTH ELEVATION**




**NORTH ELEVATION**




**WEST ELEVATION**




**EAST ELEVATION**




**SECTION A-A**




**GROUND FLOOR PLAN**



**FIRST FLOOR PLAN**



**ROOF PLAN**



SCALE 1:100  
SCALE 1:1

Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

MATERIAL KEY	
B1	FACING BRICKWORK - RED/WHITE BRICK
B2	FRONT FACED BRICKWORK STICKS WITH GRAY JOISTS - FACED WITH B1 BRICK
B3	PLUMB BRICK - TO MATCH B1 BRICK
B4	FEATURE SOLIDER COURSE TO WINDOW / DOOR - B1 BRICK
C1	SPRIG CERAMIC TUBER EFFECT BOARDING - LAPPED - COLOUR TO MATCH B1 BRICK
D1	FRONT FACED BRICKWORK STICKS WITH GRAY JOISTS - COLOUR GREY
E1	FLAT ROOF DORMER
F1	LEAD FLASHING
H1	HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE T1
H2	HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE T1
M1	MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE T1
M2	MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE T1
P1	UPVC RAINWATER GOODS - ROUND - COLOUR BLACK
R2	THROUGH COLOUR BENDER - FINI STONE
S2	CONCRETE FINI STONE ROOFLIGHTS - DIMENSIONS TO COMMON AREAS - COLOUR BLACK
T1	ROOF TILE - MARLEY/ACME SINGLE CAMBER/RY PLAN/TILES - RED SMOOTH
T2	ROOF TILE - MARLEY/ACME SINGLE CAMBER/RY PLAN/TILES - RED SMOOTH
T3	VERTICAL HANGING TILE - AS T1
U2	BALCONY WITH BALUSTRADE - BLACK METAL FINISH
W1	UPVC MECHANICAL JOINT FLUSH FINISH WINDOW - COLOUR WHITE/ASH
W2	UPVC ALUMINIUM GLAZED ENTRANCE DOOR (VARIOUS COLOURS)
RH	ROOF ACCESS HATCH
PV	INDICATIVE PHOTOLOGICAL PANEL

Project: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
Phase: PHASES 2 & 3  
Block: BLOCK B6A  
Plans: PLANS, ELEVATIONS & SECTIONS  
Status: AS PROPOSED  
Drawing No: 2496  
Date: JUN 22  
Scale: 1:100 @ A1  
Revision: APR  
Status: P01  
Drawing No: 2496-URB-B6A-ZZ-DR-A-208150





Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.


UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
 One Scogate Meads, Scogate,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
 UK  
 Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**


**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**




FIRST FLOOR PLAN



GROUND FLOOR PLAN



ROOF PLAN



SCALE 1:100  
 SCALE 1:1

NO. 100  
 REV. 01  
 DATE 01/09/2022

URBANEDGE  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Client  
**SENIOR LIVING  
 (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD**

Project  
**CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING  
 CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY  
 PHASES 2 & 3**

Location  
**B07  
 GROUND, FIRST FLOOR & ROOF PLAN  
 AS PROPOSED**

Discipline  
**PLANNING**

Drawn By  
 Checked By  
 Date  
 Status  
**2496** 1:100 @ A1 SEPT 2021 JA P01  
 2496-URB-B07-ZZ-DR-A-0208150




Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.

UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
One Scogdale Mews, Scogdale,  
Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
UK  
Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**


**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**




Test Valley Borough Council Southern Area Planning Committee April 2023

**MATERIAL KEY**


- B1 FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTI-BRICK
- B2 FACING BRICKWORK - STICKS WITH CLAY POTS - FACED WITH B1 BRICK
- B3 PLINTH BRICK - TO MATCH B1 BRICK
- B4 FEATURE SOLIDER COURSE TO WINDOW / DOOR - B1 BRICK
- C1 150MM WOOD GRANT WATER EFFECT BOARDING - LAPPED - COLOUR GREY BROWN
- D1 FINE GRADE SHAPED BRICKS - SOFTS AND ROSAS - COLOUR GREY
- E1 FLAT ROOF FORMER
- F1 LEAD FLASHING
- H1 HALF ROUND ROUGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- H2 HALF ROUND ROUGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M1 MONO PITCHED ROUGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M2 MONO PITCHED ROUGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- P1 UPVC RAINWATER GOODS - ROUND - COLOUR BLACK
- R2 THROUGH COLOUR RENDER - FINE STONE
- S2 CONCRETE FIN TILE ROOF LIGHTS - SIMILAR TO COMMON AREAS - COLOUR BLACK
- T1 ROUGE TILE - WABLEY FACE SINGLE CAMBER BY PLANTILES - RED SMOOTH
- T2 ROUGE TILE - WABLEY FACE SINGLE CAMBER BY PLANTILES - RED SANFACED
- T3 VERTICAL HANGING TILE - AS T1
- U2 BALCONY WITH BALUSTRADE - BLACK METAL FINISH
- W1 UPVC MECHANICAL JOINT FLUSH SASH WINDOW - COLOUR WHITE GRAY
- W2 UPVC ALUMINIUM GLAZED ENTRANCE DOOR - COLOUR OFF WHITE
- W3 COMPOSITE ENTRANCE DOOR (VARIOUS COLOURS)
- RH ROOF ACCESS HATCH
- PV INDICATIVE PHOTOGRAPHIC PANEL




**NORTH ELEVATION**



**SOUTH ELEVATION**




**WEST ELEVATION**




**EAST ELEVATION**



**SECTION A-A**



**SECTION B-B**



Project: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
Client: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3  
Block: BLOCK 07  
Elevations & Sections AS PROPOSED


Planning  
Date: 11/09/21  
Scale: 1:100 @ A1  
Status: P01  
Project No: 2496  
Drawing No: 2496-URB-B07-ZZ-DR-A-208250



Copyright of this drawing is the property of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited.

UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
 One Scogate Mews, Scogate,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX.  
 Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax: +44 (0)1780 755660  
**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**



Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

REV	DESCRIPTION	DATE
P04	APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION	25.04.23
P03	REVISED TO INCLUDE WITH REVISED PERIOD	14/03/22
P02	UPDATES FOLLOWING PLANNING OFFER COMMENTS	09/03/22
P01	REVISIONS TO FOLLOWING SCHEME REDRAWN	03/03/22
Rev No	01	03/03/22
Drawn By		
Date		


**URBANEDGE**  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Client  
**SENIOR LIVING  
 (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD**


Project  
**CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING  
 CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY  
 PHASES 2 & 3**

Location  
**BLOCK 08  
 GROUND, FIRST FLOOR & ROOF PLAN  
 AS PROPOSED**


Scale	Date	Drawn	Checked
1:100 @ A1	JUL 21	URD	P04
Project Reference: 2496			
Drawing Reference: 2496-URB-B08-00-DR-A-208150			




FIRST FLOOR PLAN



GROUND FLOOR PLAN





ROOF PLAN





**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**




WEST ELEVATION



WEST ELEVATION




SOUTH ELEVATION



SOUTH ELEVATION



SECTION A-A



SECTION B-B

**MATERIAL KEY**

- B1 FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTI BRICK
- B2 PREFABRICATED CHIMNEY STACKS WITH CLAY POTS - FACED WITH B1 BRICK
- B3 PLINTH BRICK - TO MATCH B1 BRICK
- B4 FEATURE SOLIDER COURSE TO WINDOW / DOOR - B1 BRICK
- C1 FIBRE CEMENT TIMBER EFFECT BOARDING - LAPPED - COLOUR GREY BROWN
- D1 FIBRE CEMENT BARGEBOARDS, SOFFITS AND FASCIAS - COLOUR GREY
- E1 FLAT ROOF DORMER
- F1 LEAD FLASHING
- H1 HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- H2 HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M1 MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M2 MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- P1 UPVC MINOR WATER GOODS - ROUND - COLOUR BLACK
- P2 THROUGH COLOUR RENDER - FLINT STONE
- S2 CONSERVATION STYLE ROOFLIGHTS - SMOKELESS TO COMMON AREAS - COLOUR BLACK
- T1 ROOF TILE - WEAVER SINGLE CAMBER BY PLAIN TILES - RED SMOOTH
- T2 ROOF TILE - WEAVER SINGLE CAMBER BY PLAIN TILES - RED SANDFACED
- U3 BALCONY WITH BALUSTRADE - BLACK METAL FINISH
- W1 UPVC MECHANICAL JOINT FLASH GASKET WITH FINISH - COLOUR WHITE ASH
- W2 PFC ALUMINIUM GATED ENTRANCE DOOR - COLOUR OFF WHITE
- W3 COMPOSITE ENTRANCE DOOR (VARIOUS COLOURS)
- RH ROOF ACCESS HATCH
- PV INDICATIVE PHOTOVOLTAIC PANEL




Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.

Urban Edge Architecture Limited  
 One Scotgate Mews, Scotgate,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX.  
 Tel. +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax. +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**



Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

Project: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
 Date: 25/03/23  
 Author: [Name]  
 Check: [Name]  
 Date: 25/03/23  
 Project No: 2496  
 Drawing No: 01



**URBANEDGE**  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning




Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD

Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3

Block: BLOCK 09

Ground: GROUND, FIRST FLOOR & ROOF PLAN AS PROPOSED

Planning: 2496-URB-B09-ZZ-DR-A-0208150




SCALE 1:100  
 SCALE 1:1  
 0m 1m 2m 4m 6m 8m 10m  
 0mm 10mm 20mm 40mm 60mm 80mm 100mm

Copyright of this drawing is the property of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited.

UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
One Scogate Mews, Scogate,  
Salford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**



West Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

**MATERIAL KEY**

- B1 FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTIBRICK
- B2 PREFABRICATED CHIMNEY STACKS WITH CHIMNEYS - FACED WITH BRICK
- B3 PAINTED BRICK - TO MATCH B1 BRICK
- B4 FEATURE FOLDER COURSE TO WINDOW/DOOR
- C1 FIBRE CEMENT TIMBER EFFECT BOARDING - RED - COLOUR: GREY BROWN
- D1 FIBRE CEMENT BARGEBOARDS, SOFFITS AND EAVES - COLOUR: GREY
- E1 FLAT ROOF DOWNER
- F1 LEAD FLASHING
- H1 HALF ROUND ROGETILE - TO MATCH TILE
- H2 HALF ROUND ROGETILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M1 MONO PITCHED ROGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M2 MONO PITCHED ROGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- P1 UPVC WATER GOODS - ROUND - COLOUR: BLACK
- R1 THROUGH COLOUR RENDER - FLINT STONE
- S2 CONSERVATION STYLE ROOFLIGHTS - BLACK METAL FRAMES - COLOUR: BLACK
- T1 ROOF TILE - WALEY AZBE SINGLE CAMBER - PLAIN TILES - RES: SMOOTH
- T2 ROOF TILE - WALEY AZBE SINGLE CAMBER - PLAIN TILES - RES: SANDFASD
- T3 VERTICAL HINGING TILE - AS T1
- U2 BALCONY WITH BALUSTRADE - BLACK METAL FRAMES
- W1 UPVC MECHANICAL JOINT FLASHING - COLOUR: WHITE/ASH
- W2 PPK ALUMINIUM GLAZED ENTRANCE DOORS - COLOUR: OFF WHITE
- W3 COMPOSITE ENTRANCE DOOR (VARIOUS COLOURS)
- RH ROOF ACCESS HATCH
- PV INDICATIVE PHOTOGLINTIC PANEL

**URBANEDGE**  
architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Drawn By: Date:  
Checked By: Date:  
Approved By: Date:





23/03/23  
23/03/23  
23/03/23  
23/03/23  
23/03/23  
23/03/23

**SENIOR LIVING**  
**(CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD**

**CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3**

**BLOCK 09 ELEVATIONS & SECTION AS PROPOSED**

**PLANNING**  
2496  
1:100 @ A1  
AUGUST 21  
UKD  
R03  
2496-URB-B09-ZZ-DR-A-208250






Copyright of this drawing is the property of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited.

UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
One Scogdale Mews, Scogdale,  
Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
Fax: +44 (0)1780 755660

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**




Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3  
Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
Drawing No: 2496-URB-B11-00-DR-A-208150  
Date: 21/08/2023  
Drawn By: [Name]  
Checked By: [Name]




Drawn	Check	Revise	Issue	Project
[Name]	[Name]	[Name]	AUG 21	P02


Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3  
Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
Drawing No: 2496-URB-B11-00-DR-A-208150  
Date: 21/08/2023  
Drawn By: [Name]  
Checked By: [Name]




GROUND FLOOR PLAN





FIRST FLOOR PLAN




ROOF PLAN








WEST ELEVATION



EAST ELEVATION



NORTH ELEVATION




SOUTH ELEVATION

**MATERIAL KEY**

- B1 FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTI-BRICK
- B2 FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTI-BRICK STACKS WITH CLAY POTS - FACED WITH B1 BRICK
- B3 PLINTH BRICK - TO MATCH B1 BRICK
- B4 FEATURE SOLIDER COURSE TO WINDOW / DOOR - B1 BRICK
- C1 BRICKWORK WITH WOOD EFFECT BOARDING - LAPPED - COLOUR GREY BROWN
- D1 FINE GRADE BRICKWORK - SOFTENED AND FINISHED - COLOUR GREY
- E1 FLAT ROOF DORMER
- F1 LEAD FLASHING
- H1 HALF ROUND ROOF TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- H2 HALF ROUND ROOF TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M1 MONO PITCHED ROOF TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M2 MONO PITCHED ROOF TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- P1 UPVC RAINWATER GOODS - ROUND - COLOUR BLACK
- R2 THROUGH COLOUR BRICKS - FINE STONE
- S2 CONCRETE FINISH TILE ROOFLIGHTS - SIMONENTS TO COMMON AREAS - COLOUR BLACK
- T1 ROOF TILE - LAMBLEY ACHIE SINGLE CAMBERED - PLANTILES - RED SMOOTH
- T2 ROOF TILE - LAMBLEY ACHIE SINGLE CAMBERED - PLANTILES - RED SANFACED
- T3 VERTICAL HANGING TILE - AS T1
- U2 BALCONY WITH BALUSTRADE - BLACK METAL FINISH
- W1 UPVC MECHANICAL JOINT FLUSH SASH WINDOW - COLOUR WHITE - ASH
- W2 UPVC ALUMINIUM GLAZED ENTRANCE DOOR - COLOUR OFF WHITE
- W3 COMPOSITE ENTRANCE DOOR (VARIOUS COLOURS)
- RH ROOF ACCESS HATCH
- PV INDICATIVE PHOTOLOGICAL PANEL

Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023



SECTION A-A

PREPARED BY: URBANEDGE ARCHITECTURE LTD  
 DRAWN BY: URBANEDGE ARCHITECTURE LTD  
 CHECKED BY: URBANEDGE ARCHITECTURE LTD  
 DATE: 25/04/2023



Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD

Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3

Location: BLOCK 11 ELEVATIONS & SECTIONS AS PROPOSED

PLANNING

Drawn	Check	Issue	Scale	Project
24996	1:100 @ A1	AUG 21	RM	P02

2496-URB-B11-ZZ-DR-A-208250






Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.

Urban Edge Architecture Limited  
 One Scotgate Mews, Scotgate,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
 Tel. +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax. +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**







Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

Project: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD  
 Client: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3  
 Block: BLOCK 12  
 Ground, First Floor & Roof Plan AS PROPOSED

Urban Edge  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Project No: 2496  
 Date: 21 SEP 23  
 Scale: 1:100 @ A1  
 Status: R02

2496-URB-B12-ZZ-DR-A-208150




Copyright of this drawing is the property of Urban Edge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of Urban Edge Architecture Limited.

Urban Edge Architecture Limited  
 One Scotgate Mews, Scotgate,  
 Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX,  
 Tel. +44 (0)1780 755665  
 Fax. +44 (0)1780 755360

**THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION**

**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**



Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

**MATERIAL KEY**

- B1 FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTIBRICK
- B2 PREFABRICATED CHIMNEY STACKS WITH CHIMNEY CAPS - RED WITH B1 BRICK
- B3 PUNTH BRICK - TO MATCH B1 BRICK
- B4 BRICK VENEER COURSE TO WINDOW / TO MATCH B1 BRICK
- C1 FRISK GRANIT TIMBER EFFECT BOARDING - RED-COLOUR GREY BROWN
- D1 FRISK GRANIT BARSEBANDS, SOFFITS AND ROOFING - COLOUR GREY
- E1 FLAT ROOF DOORNER
- F1 LEAD FLASHING
- H1 HALF ROUND ROGETILE - TO MATCH TILE
- H2 HALF ROUND ROGETILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M1 MONO PITCHED ROGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M2 MONO PITCHED ROGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- UPVC IN WATER GOODS - ROUND - COLOUR BLACK
- R2 THROUGH COLOUR RENDER - FLINT STONE
- S2 CONSERVATION STYLE ROOFLIGHTS - SMOKE TO COMMON AREAS - COLOUR BLACK
- T1 ROOFTILE - WABLEY ADE SINGLE CAMBER - PLAIN TILES - RED SMOOTH
- T2 ROOFTILE - WABLEY ADE SINGLE CAMBER - PLAIN TILES - RED SANDFACED
- T3 VERTICAL HANGING TILE - AS T1
- U2 BALCONY WITH BAULSTAKE - BLACK METAL BALUNGS
- W1 UPVC WINDOW WITH FLUSH FASTENING - COLOUR WHITE LASH
- W2 UPVC ALUMINIUM GLAZED ENTRANCE DOOR - COLOUR OFF WHITE
- W3 COMPOSITE ENTRANCE DOOR (WINDOWS COLOUR OFF WHITE)
- RH ROOF ACCESS HATCH
- PV INDICATIVE PHOTOGRAPHIC PANEL

23/01/2023  
 1:100 @ A1  
 24/09/21  
 2496

**URBANEDGE**  
 architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD


Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3

Block: BLOCK 12


Elevations & Sections AS PROPOSED

FOR PLANNING


2496-URB-B12-ZZ-DR-A-208250



EAST ELEVATION



WEST ELEVATION




SOUTH ELEVATION




NORTH ELEVATION




SECTION A-A




SECTION B-B









GROUND FLOOR PLAN



FIRST FLOOR PLAN



ROOF PLAN






Copyright of this drawing is the property of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited. It must not be reproduced or amended without the express consent in writing of UrbanEdge Architecture Limited.

UrbanEdge Architecture Limited  
One Scogate Mews, Scogate,  
Stamford, Lincolnshire, PE9 2FX.

Tel: +44 (0)1780 755665  
Fax: +44 (0)1780 755360  
THIS DRAWING IS FOR PLANNING ONLY AND IS NOT TO BE USED FOR TENDER OR CONSTRUCTION


**DRAWING TO BE READ IN COLOUR**




Test Valley Borough Council - Southern Area Planning Committee - 25 April 2023

**MATERIAL KEY**


- B1 FACING BRICKWORK - RED MULTI BRICK
- B2 PRECASTED CHAMFER STACKS WITH CLAY POTS - FACED WITH B1 BRICK
- B3 FLINT BRICK - TO MATCH B1 BRICK
- B4 FERRIS SOLIDER COURSE TO WINDOW / DOOR - B1 BRICK
- C1 FERRIS GUNWATER THINSET EFFECT BOARDING - LAMPED - COLOUR GREY BROWN
- D1 FERRIS GUNWATER THINSET EFFECT BOARDING - LAMPED - COLOUR GREY
- E1 FLAT ROOF DORMER
- F1 LEAD FLASHING
- H1 HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- H2 HALF ROUND RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M1 MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- M2 MONO PITCHED RIDGE TILE - TO MATCH TILE
- P1 UPVC PANWATER GOODS - ROUND - COLOUR BLACK
- R2 THROUGH COLOUR BENDER - FLINT STONE
- S2 CONSERVATION STYLE ROOFLIGHTS - SHIMMERS TO COMMON AREAS - COLOUR BLACK
- T1 ROOF TILE - MARLEY ACME SINGLE CAMBERBY PLANTILES - RED SMOOTH
- T2 ROOF TILE - MARLEY ACME SINGLE CAMBERBY PLANTILES - RED SANFACED
- T3 VERTICAL HANGING TILE - AS T1
- U2 BALCONY WITH BALUSTRADE - BLACK METAL FINISH
- W1 UPVC WINDOW
- W2 UPVC ALUMINIUM JOINT FLUSH LASH WINDOW - COLOUR OFF WHITE
- W3 COMPOSITE ENTRANCE DOOR (VARIOUS COLOURS)
- RH ROOF ACCESS HATCH
- PV INDICATIVE PHOTOVA TAG PANEL




**SOUTH ELEVATION**




**NORTH ELEVATION**



**WEST ELEVATION**



**EAST ELEVATION**



**SECTION A-A**

URBANEDGE  
architecture / landscape / masterplanning

Client: SENIOR LIVING (CHANDLER'S FORD) LTD


Project: CHANDLER'S FORD CONTINUING CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY PHASES 2 & 3

Location: BLOCK 13 ELEVATIONS & SECTIONS AS PROPOSED

PLANNING

Drawn	Checked	Drawn	Checked
2496	1:100 @ A1	JUN 22	APR
Scale		Status	
P00		P00	

2496-URB-B13-ZZ-DR-A-20250





## ITEM 8

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	21/02965/OUTS
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	OUTLINE APPLICATION - SOUTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	11.10.2021
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr Russell Duke
<b>SITE</b>	Land To The Rear of The Paddocks, Winchester Road, Ampfield, SO51 9BG, <b>AMPFIELD</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Outline application for detached dwelling and garage with all matters reserved
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> July 2022 – amended ecology assessment received 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2022 – amended nitrate calculation received 9 <sup>th</sup> January 2023 – additional plans outlining fire tender access 23 <sup>rd</sup> February 2023 – additional plan outlining fire tender access
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Kate Levey

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

[Click here to view application](#)

---

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been called to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a member.

### 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is located within the settlement boundary to the south of Winchester Hill in Ampfield. The site area measures approximately 1,239 square metres (not including the access route). The site has flat topography, and is accessed via a single track access road from Winchester Road.

### 3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 This proposal is an outline application (with all matters reserved) for a detached dwelling and garage.
- 3.2 Though the application is not seeking permission for any specific reserved matters, the submitted application form and indicative plans show a dwelling with four bedrooms, a detached garage, a garden to the rear and side and access from Winchester Road.

### 4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 None relevant to this proposal

## 5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 Ecology: no objection

5.2 Trees: no objection subject to condition

5.3 Environmental Protection: no objection

5.4 HCC Highways: no in principle objection

5.5 Natural England: no objection

5.6 Building control: objection

External access enabling fire appliance to be used near the building appears to be unacceptable under Approved Document B5. I would therefore advise consulting with Hampshire & Isle of Wight Fire and rescue Service to see if it is acceptable for a Fire appliance to attend the r/o The Paddocks Ampfield or whether a Sprinkler System (BS9251) is required under Approved Document B1.

5.7 Following receipt of the Building Control comments, HCC Highways were re-consulted and raised no in principle objection. Site access for fire tender is a matter discussed within the planning considerations section below.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 27.10.2022

6.1 **Ampfield Parish Council:** objection (summarised)

- The proposal is not in accordance with the Ampfield Village Design Statement. Specifically with regard to back land development
- The building is higher than neighbours
- Overlooking to private amenity space of neighbours
- Concern about noise and vibration from vehicles using the access drive
- Trees and vegetation have recently been cleared from the site. Assertions made about the site being cleared annually are incorrect and accuracy of the ecology survey is questioned
- The drainage ditch for the septic tank is overgrown and is this adequate
- Concern that there is insufficient space on site for vehicles to turn around
- Highway safety concerns

6.2 9 letters of objection from the occupiers of 1, 2 and 3 The Paddocks (summarised)

### Design

- The proposal would result in disruption to the settlement pattern of the area
- The proposal does not comply with policies E1 and E2 of the RLP, Village Design Statement and Landscape Character Assessment

### Foul water drainage

- Is the foul water management of the site sustainable
- The field has always been a field and is not urban for the purposes of the nitrate neutrality budget

- Concern about smells, noise and vibration from any proposed sewerage treatment plant
- Concern about a reported build up of effluent in the tributary of Tadburn Lake
- The pipes between septic tanks of 1 – 3 The Paddocks and the soakaway pass through the site area and underneath the driveway of the proposed development
- Unsure on the ownership of the drainage ditch

#### Ecology

- The site is not accurately represented in the ecological report – it has been unmaintained for years
- Grassland and trees were removed prior to the ecological survey taking place so the biodiversity net gain has been calculated incorrectly
- Concerns about nitrate neutrality and New Forest SPA
- The site can not connect to Romsey waste water treatment plant and so the HRA completed is incorrect

#### Amenity of neighbouring properties

- The ground elevation of the house is higher than the neighbours at The Paddocks, the proposed dwelling would be imposing
- Concern about overlooking to Heritage, The Paddocks and Grosvenor House
- Concern about loss of light to gardens in the Paddocks
- Concern about noise, vibration, fumes and damage to septic tank outflow pipe running under the driveway, resulting from vehicles using the driveway adjacent to 1 The Paddocks

#### Access

- The access track is unsuitable for large vehicles and fire appliance as there is insufficient turning space at the end of the driveway
- Building materials will be left on the public verge impacting visibility splays and damage to verges
- Highway safety concerns
- Concern that construction vehicles may park on Winchester Road which is a no stopping route

#### Need

- Is there a need for the new dwelling given other new houses in Ampfield

### 7.0 **POLICY**

#### 7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

#### 7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(TVBRLP)

COM2: Settlement hierarchy

E1: High quality development in the Borough

E2: Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough

E5: Biodiversity  
E7: Water Management  
E8: Pollution  
LHW4: Amenity  
T1: Managing movement  
T2: Parking provision

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)  
Ampfield Village Design Statement 2019

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Arboriculture
- Biodiversity
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highways
- Parking provision

8.2 **Principle of development**

The site lies within the settlement boundary as defined on the Inset Maps of the TVBRLP. In accordance with Policy COM2 of the TVBRLP development is permitted provided the proposal is appropriate to other policies of the Revised Local Plan. The proposal is assessed against relevant policies below.

8.3 **Character and appearance of the area**

The design and layout of the proposed development would be assessed against the requirements of Policies E1 and E2 at the reserved matters stage. However, indicative plans showing a detached dwelling and garage accompany the application and these demonstrate that a dwelling could be provided within the plot which would be in keeping with other detached dwellings in this area, specifically those within The Paddocks to the north. As the application site is located a substantial distance away from public vantage points (64 metres to Ampfield Hill and 75 metres from the access road at Grosvenor Court), there is unlikely to be any clear views of the proposed development from the public realm. However, any glimpsed views would be seen in context with surrounding built development which consists of detached, two storey dwellings. As a result, no concerns are raised with the outline application in relation to this material consideration.

8.4 Concerns have been raised by local residents and the Parish Council that the proposal conflicts with the Ampfield Village Design Statement, specifically relating to 'backland' development.

Paragraph 2 of the Ampfield Village Design Statement under 'design principles settlements planning guidance' on page 27 states as follows:

*'2) In-fill or back-land development may be acceptable within settlement areas only where it does not adversely affect the existing overall appearance of the settlement area; having regard to important scenic gaps, views, woodland, trees, hedges, etc. The building design, layout, and landscaping of any such development should be in harmony with the characteristics of its surroundings.'*

8.5 The Village Design Statement does not preclude this form of development. As set out in paragraph 8.4 above, views into the site are limited and any glimpsed views of the proposed detached dwelling would be seen in context with other detached, two storey dwellings. Accordingly, siting a dwelling in the location shown on the indicative plans and of the size shown would not result in material harm to the nature of the village. Furthermore, with each case determined on its own merits, this development would also not set a precedent for future development or undermine the Village Design Statement, particularly as the site in question is located within the settlement boundary where development of new dwellings is acceptable in principle, unlike a site located beyond the settlement boundary.

#### 8.6 **Arboriculture**

The indicative location for the access and garage are in close proximity to mature trees as well as a mature hedgerow. The application is supported by an arboricultural report (Alderwood Consulting Limited, December 2021). The arboricultural information identifies the arboricultural constraints of the site and includes a tree protection plan. It is secured by condition that the recommendations within this document are adhered to during development. Subject to this condition, the proposal accords with policy E2 of the RLP.

#### 8.7 **Water management**

The application site is not located in an area of high flood risk. Taking into consideration the location of the site and the site constraints it is considered that, subject to conditions and an assessment at reserved matters stage relating to onsite drainage measures and water efficiency measures, no harm would occur and there would be no conflict with Policy E7 of the RLP.

#### 8.8 **Foul drainage provision**

In the absence of any available connection to mains sewerage, an arrangement for either the installation of a septic tank or package treatment plant will be required and this specific detail will be provided as part of the reserved matters stage. Given the amount of available space at the application site it is considered that an acceptable layout could be provided.

#### 8.9 **Neighbouring amenity**

The siting, design and scale of the proposed dwelling will be considered at the reserved matters stage against the requirements of Policy LHW4. However, to assist in considering this matter and to demonstrate that a dwelling and garage could be provided without resulting in harm to the amenities of adjoining properties an indicative site layout has been provided. The indicative plans demonstrate that there is sufficient separation distance between the dwelling/garage and the surrounding existing dwellings to ensure that there is no significant adverse impact on neighbour amenity.

8.10 Existing dwellings within the Paddocks are located in excess of 17 metres from the shared boundary with the site. The dwelling shown on the indicative plans would be located in excess of 30 metres away from Tudor Wood to the south east, and in excess of 21 metres away from Grosvenor Court to the west. In the absence of any residential property in close proximity to the application site, it is considered that the proposal can be designed to avoid any significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and provide sufficient outdoor amenity space for potential future occupants of the proposed dwelling. As such, no concerns are raised with the outline application in relation to this material consideration. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy LHW4.

#### 8.11 **Highways**

##### Access

The access into the site is a matter reserved for later consideration. However, the application has been accompanied by plans indicating how the dwelling might be accessed. There is an existing access point onto Ampfield Hill which is currently utilised by occupiers of The Paddocks. This access also leads to a single width track into the application site. The track is approximately 5.6 metres wide between the boundaries, and the hedgerow along the boundaries has recently been cut back. The access has two gates positioned along its length.

8.12 Details of the access arrangements will be provided and considered in detail at the reserved matters stage. Taking into consideration the indicative location shown on the submitted plans, the limited amount of additional vehicle movements that would be generated by the construction of one dwelling, and due to the existing access track onto the highway, no concerns are raised with the principle of the access serving the proposed dwelling. Therefore, it is considered that a safe access, which would not cause severe harm to highway safety or significant adverse harm to the amenity of adjoining residential properties, can be provided to the application site.

8.13 Consideration has been given to site access by fire tender appliance. A recent appeal decision (reference APP/W0340/W/22/3293964, 72 Windmill Road in Reading) identified concern about the access route for emergency vehicles. The appeal submission suggested that a sprinkler system would compensate for a lack of fire service access. The inspector in that appeal was of the view that it would not be appropriate to leave the matter of fire safety until Building Regulations stage and therefore dismissed the appeal. The planning inspectorate was not satisfied that an appliance could get to within 45 metres of the proposed dwelling and stated that the matter needed to be considered at the planning stage. He felt that sprinklers would not adequately mitigate against the significant shortcomings of the access.

8.14 The Building Regulations 2010 (2019 edition incorporating 2020 and 2022 amendments) document, Requirement B5 (access and facilities for the fire service) states that:

*'Requirement*

*Access and facilities for the fire service*

*B5. 1) The building shall be designed and constructed so as to provide reasonable facilities to assist fire fighters in the protection of life.*

*2) Reasonable provision shall be made within the site of the building to enable fire appliances to gain access to the building.'*

- 8.15 The site is located 56 metres away from Ampfield Hill. In light of the Building Control objection, HCC Highways were consulted. In order for a Fire Appliance to service the site it must either be able to park on the public highway or private land within 45m of the dwelling entrance or service internally to the site. Table 13.1 within The Building Regulations 2010 (2019 edition incorporating 2020 and 2022 amendments) document, Requirement B5 sets out that the minimum width of road between kerbs should be 3.7 metres. This 3.7 metre requirement is the space required for Firefighters to operate around a pump appliance and not the minimum width required for vehicular access which can be reduced to a minimum of 2.75 metres over short distances. An additional plan has been provided by the applicant's agent (reference 21010 A PL 010 H) and demonstrates that the hedgerows on both sides of the access shall be cut back to maintain a 3.7 metre width. HCC Highways have advised that 3.7 metres is the space requirement for firefighters to operate in the event of a fire.
- 8.16 The internal site layout as shown on the indicative plans would not allow for a Fire Appliance to turn within the site. However, as the access is over 3.7 metres wide, a fire appliance could drive 20 metres down the track and then service the site within 45 metres of the dwelling entrance. The fire appliance could then reverse out of the site. The dimensions of the site access are considered to be acceptable and no objection is raised by the Highways Officer. As such, no concerns are raised with the outline application in relation to this material consideration.
- 8.17 The running carriageway width is not below 3.7 metres and so in this instance it is not deemed necessary to consult with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Fire and Rescue Service. The proposal is therefore compliant with policy T1 of the TVBRLP
- 8.18 Parking  
A detailed site layout will be assessed at the reserved matters stage against the minimum parking standards set out in Annexe G and Policy T2 of the TVBRLP. Taking into consideration the indicative plans it is considered that there is space for sufficient onsite parking provision, within the proposed garage and in the parking area to the front of the garage and for vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward gear. As such, no concerns are raised with the outline application in relation to this material consideration. The proposal would therefore accord with policy T2 and annex G, and a condition has been added to this recommendation such that any reserved matters application shall meet the requirements of the Council's parking standards.



8.19 **Biodiversity**

On site biodiversity – protected species

This application is supported by ecological assessments. The initial Ecological Assessment (Peach Ecology, September 2021) outlined that an eDNA test for great crested newts was conducted on the pond within 200m of the site. Despite records of breeding newts within this pond in 2014 (egg found during survey), the DNA results from samples taken in 2021 were negative. It is outlined that as only a single egg was found within the initial survey (2014), this is indicative of a low breeding population which is no longer present.

- 8.20 It is outlined that the grassland habitat on site is considered to be of low suitability for reptiles and amphibians due to the short height at the time of survey (recently cut) and that the grassland is cut annually. However, it is also outlined that the species composition and structure of the grassland indicates that the site is left unmanaged for prolonged periods of time (a year or more). As it is only cut annually, this would indicate that for the majority of the year, the grassland is longer, potentially more tussocky, and therefore of higher suitability for reptiles and amphibians.
- 8.21 Within GCN surveys, a single egg is sufficient to confirm the presence of breeding GCN. In light of this, further details regarding the previous surveys conducted on the pond within 200m of the proposed development site has been submitted. The eDNA survey conducted for the purposes of this application (conducted in 2021) returned a negative result for GCN, and therefore it is considered unlikely that an EPS licence would be required and granted by Natural England for this site (due to the low suitability of habitats on site and negative eDNA results in the latest survey). This is supported by the submitted Natural England rapid risk assessment tool, which indicates that an offence is considered highly unlikely.
- 8.22 The likelihood of GCN being present on site is considered to be very low, and therefore an EPS licence is considered unlikely to be required. However, due to the historical presence of GCN, and the presence of other ponds locally with good connectivity to the application site, the presence of GCN locally cannot be discounted completely. A precautionary method statement for the site clearance works has been submitted (included within the Peach Ecology ecological assessment, July 2022) and it is secured by condition of this recommendation that development shall proceed in accordance with the measures set out within this report.
- 8.23 Subject to conditions, the proposal is not considered to give rise to any adverse impacts on existing habitat or on-site ecology, and the proposal is in accordance with Policy E5.
- 8.24 The Ecologist requested a lighting condition however this site is not within the Mottisfont Bat SAC buffer zone and so a condition regarding external lighting is not considered reasonable or necessary. A further condition about biodiversity enhancements is also acknowledged, however the scheme is for a single dwelling and not currently subject to biodiversity net gain and so imposing such a condition is considered unreasonable in this instance.

8.25 Off site biodiversity: Nitrate Neutrality

There is existing evidence of high levels of nitrogen and phosphorous in the water environment across the Solent, with evidence of eutrophication at some designated sites. An integrated Water Management Study for South Hampshire was commissioned by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Authorities to examine the delivery of development growth in relation to legislative and government policy requirements for designated sites and wider biodiversity. This work has identified that there is uncertainty regarding whether any new housing development would require measures to address this issue to ensure that overall new development does not contribute to net increases in nutrients entering these designated sites.

8.26 As such, the advice from Natural England is that the applicants for development proposals resulting in a net increase in dwellings are required to submit the nitrogen budget for the development to demonstrate no likely significant effect on the European designated sites due to the increase in waste water from the new housing.

8.27 The third party objection stating that the proposed development is not connected to the Romsey Waste Water Treatment Works is acknowledged. This error within the initial appropriate assessment has been rectified, whereby an amended appropriate assessment which applies a package treatment plant has been reviewed by Natural England with no objections raised.

8.28 To identify the amount of nitrate loading generated by the proposed development, a nutrient budget calculation has been undertaken in accordance with Natural England's standard methodology and calculator spreadsheet. As part of undertaking this calculation it has been identified that the proposed development will be served by a package treatment plant, in the absence of an available connection to a waste water treatment plant. This calculation has identified that the proposed development will generate 11.08kg TN / year. As such, in order to lawfully be permitted, the proposed development will need to include a package of avoidance and mitigation measures to offset the nitrogen load from the development.

8.29 To address this issue, the applicant has agreed to purchase credits to offset agricultural land previously utilised for the purposes of pig farming, located at Roke, Awbridge. The agent has agreed to purchase these credits through the Test Valley Borough Council strategic mitigation scheme. Following the implementation of this offsetting at Roke, a substantial net reduction in nitrate loading within the Solent catchment area will be achieved. The payment of credits will be secured by Test Valley Borough Council through the submission of a completed section 106 agreement prior to permission being granted.

8.30 The applicant has confirmed that they would enter into a legal agreement to secure off site mitigation land to be taken out of production in perpetuity. An appropriate assessment has been carried out and this has been reviewed by Natural England. It is concluded that the development can achieve nutrient neutrality by offsetting the increase in the nitrogen load and would therefore not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the Solent designated sites through water quality from nitrate impacts. The development would therefore satisfy Policies E5 and E8 of the RLP in this regard.

8.31 Off site biodiversity: New Forest SPA

In line with Policy E5 and Section 11 of the NPPF, consideration should be given to potential implications on international designations. The development would result in a net increase in residential dwellings within 13.8km of the New Forest SPA. This distance defines the zone identified by recent research where new residents would be considered likely to visit the New Forest. The New Forest SPA supports a range of bird species that are vulnerable to impacts arising from increases in recreational use of the Forest that result from new housing development. While clearly one new house on its own would not result in any significant effects, it has been demonstrated through research, and agreed by Natural England (the governments statutory nature conservation advisors, who have provided comments on this proposal) that any net increase (even single dwellings) would have a likely significant effect on the SPA when considered in combination with other plans and projects.

8.32 To address this issue, Test Valley Borough Council has adopted an interim mitigation strategy whereby a scale of developer contributions of £1,300 per new dwelling has been agreed that would fund the delivery of a new strategic area of alternative recreational open space that would offer the same sort of recreational opportunities as those offered by the New Forest. The applicant has confirmed that they would enter into a legal agreement to secure the required mitigation contribution. An appropriate assessment has been carried out and this has been reviewed by Natural England, with no objection raised. The application can demonstrate that the required mitigation measures can be secured, in accordance with the Council's adopted 'New Forest SPA Mitigation - Interim Framework'. As such, the development would not have an in-combination likely significant effect on the interest features of these designated sites, as a result of increased recreational pressure. The development would therefore satisfy Policy E5 of the RLP and the adopted New Forest SPA Mitigation - Interim Framework in this regard.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable in principle and, subject to conditions, would not result in any adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, on trees, neighbour amenity, highways or ecology. The outline proposal is therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies contained within the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and outline permission is therefore recommended. The Officer recommendation reflects the requirements for completion of a S106 legal agreement prior to any outline permission being granted.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

**Delegate to Head of Planning & Building for completion of satisfactory legal agreement to secure**

- **Removal of nitrate mitigation land from agricultural production;**
- **Future management of the nitrate mitigation land**
- **Nitrate Offsetting Admin Fee**
- **S106 monitoring fee**
- **New Forest SPA contribution**

**Then PERMISSION subject to:**

1. **Applications for the approval of all the reserved matters referred to herein shall be made within a period of five years from the date of this permission. The development to which the permission relates shall be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:**
  - i) **five years from the date of this permission: or**
  - ii) **three years from the final approval of the said reserved matters, or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.**

**Reason: To comply with the provision of S.92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.**
2. **Approval of the details of the layout, scale and appearance of the building(s), along with landscaping of the site and access to it (herein after called "the reserved matters" shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in writing before the development is commenced.**

**Reason: To comply with Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Management Procedure) (England) Development Procedure) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order).**
3. **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as follows:**

**Site location plan 21010-A-PL-001A**

**Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
4. **The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out within the Alderwood Consulting Limit Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Tree Protection reference D2178AIA dated 21st December 2021.**

**Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.**
5. **The development hereby approved shall be designed and built to meet Regulation 36 2 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015.**

**Reason: In the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**

6. **Development shall proceed in accordance with the measures set out in Section 5.0 'Requirements and Recommendations' of the Land off Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, Ecology Assessment (Peach Ecology, July 2022). Thereafter, the mitigation and enhancement measures shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.**


**Reason: To ensure the favourable conservation status of protected species and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, the NPPF and Policy E5 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan DPD.**

7. **Any reserved matters application shall meet the requirements of the Council's parking standards as set out in policy T2 and annex G of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**

**Reason: To ensure that adequate parking provision is required in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) policy T2 and annex G.**

**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.**
  2. **Great crested newts receive strict legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All work must stop immediately if great crested newts are encountered at any point during this development. Should this occur, further advice should be sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist.**
-




**Siteplan**



REPRODUCED FROM ORDNANCE SURVEY MAPPING  
 WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF  
 HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICER © CROWN COPYRIGHT.  
 UNAUTHORISED REPRODUCTION INFRINGES CROWN COPYRIGHT  
 AND MAY LEAD TO PROSECUTION OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS.

**21/02965/OUTS**



Mapping contents (c) Crown copyright and database rights 2021 Ordnance Survey 100035207

wessex house upper market street eastleigh hampshire SO50 9FD  
 t: 01794 830660 e: enquiries@vision-architects.org.uk

**VISION**  
 architects

drawing No: **21010-A-PL-001** revision: **A**

scale: 1:1250 @ A4 client: Mr Russell Duke  
 date: August 2021 project: Land at Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD.  
 drawn: AJC drawing: Location Plan  
 checked: dp status: PLANNING


rev.	description	date	by	ch	dp
A	Planning Issue	2020.08.24	AJC		

notes

© Copyright Reserved

- This drawing is the copyright of vision architects limited
- DO NOT copy, alter or reproduced in any way or pass to a third party without written authority
- ~~DO NOT scale these drawings~~ - dimensions to be checked on site prior to commencing any work
- READ in conjunction with other Consultants documentation & drawings regarding this project
- DISCREPANCIES should be reported in writing to the project architect or engineer immediately

MODEL FILE REFERENCE: 21010-A-PL



**notes** © Copyright Reserved

1. This drawing is the copyright of **vision architects limited**
2. DO NOT copy, alter or reproduced in any way or pass to a third party without written authority
3. ~~DO NOT scale these drawings~~ - dimensions to be checked on site prior to commencing any work
4. READ in conjunction with other Consultants documentation & drawings regarding this project
5. DISCREPANCIES should be reported in writing to the project architect or engineer immediately

MODEL FILE REFERENCE : 21010-A-P-PL

B Drawing sheet size and scale amended/ ditch indicated  
 A Planning Issue  
 rev. description

2021.09.01	AJC	do
2021.08.24	JC	do

date



scale: 1:200 @ A1  
 client: Mr Russell Duke  
 date: August 2021  
 project: Land at Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD.  
 drawn: AJC  
 drawing: Existing Site Plan  
 status: PLANNING

wessex house upper market street eastleigh hampshire SO50 9FD  
 t: 01794 830660 e: enquiries@vision-architects.org.uk

**vision**  
 architects

drawing No: 21010-A-PL-005 revision: B





Mapping contents (c) Crown copyright and database rights 2021 Ordnance Survey 100035207

<p>notes</p> <p>1. This drawing is the copyright of <b>vision architects limited</b></p> <p>2. DO NOT copy, alter or reproduced in any way or pass to a third party without written authority</p> <p><del>3. DO NOT scale these drawings</del> - dimensions to be checked on site prior to commencing any work</p> <p>4. READ in conjunction with other Consultants documentation &amp; drawings regarding this project</p> <p>5. DISCREPANCIES should be reported in writing to the project architect or engineer immediately</p> <p>MODEL FILE REFERENCE 21010-A-P-PL</p>	<p>© Copyright Reserved</p>
---	-----------------------------

<p>A Planning Issue</p> <p>rev. description</p>	<p>2021.08.24</p> <p>date</p>	<p>1 of 1</p> <p>Page 75</p>
---	-------------------------------	------------------------------

<p>scale: 1:500 @ A3</p> <p>date: August 2021</p> <p>drawn: AJC</p>	<p>client: Mr Russell Duke</p> <p>project: Land at Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD.</p> <p>drawing: Block Plan</p> <p>status: PLANNING</p>
---	--


wessex house upper market street eastleigh hampshire SO50 9FD  
 t: 01794 830660 e: enquiries@vision-architects.org.uk

**vision**  
 architects

drawing No: 21010-A-PL-002 revision: A



**LEGEND:**

 Existing tree, Tree Reference Number (eg T1) & Root Protection Area (RPA) shown in a dashed line

NOTE: Information copied from arboriculturalist drawing - refer to Alderwood Consultants Ltd original drawing

0 10m 20m

notes	© Copyright Reserved
1. This drawing is the copyright of vision architects limited	
2. DO NOT copy, alter or reproduced in any way or pass to a third party without written authority	
3. <del>DO NOT scale these drawings</del> - dimensions to be checked on site prior to commencing any work	
4. READ in conjunction with other Consultants documentation & drawings regarding this project	
5. DISCREPANCIES should be reported in writing to the project architect or engineer immediately	
MODEL FILE REFERENCE :21010-A-P-PL	

F	2021.12.22	dp	AJC
Alderwood Consulting Root Protection Areas indicated	2021.12.21	dp	AJC
Dwelling & Garage moved in response to RPA's	2021.09.27	dp	AJC
Drawing file amended	2021.09.27	dp	AJC
Drawing file amended	2021.09.27	dp	AJC
Drawing sheet size and scale amended/ ditch indicated	2021.09.01	AJC	dp
Planning Issue	2021.08.24	AJC	dp
rev. description	date	by	checked by

scale: 1:200 @ A1	client: Mr Russell Duke
date: August 2021	project: Land at Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD.
drawn: AJC	drawing: Indicative Proposed Layout
status: PLANNING	

wessex house upper market street eastleigh hampshire SO50 9FD  
t: 01794 830660 e: enquiries@vision-architects.org.uk


**vision**  
architects

drawing No: 21010-A-PL-010 revision: F



**Legend:**

Application Boundary

 Existing tree, Tree Reference Number (eg T1) & Root Protection Area (RPA) shown in a dashed line

NOTE: Information copied from arboriculturalist drawing - refer to Alderwood Consultants Ltd original drawing



**notes**

1. This drawing is the copyright of **vision architects limited**

2. DO NOT copy, alter or reproduce in any way or pass to a third party without written authority

3. ~~DO NOT scale these drawings~~ - dimensions to be checked on site prior to commencing any work

4. READ in conjunction with other Consultants documentation & drawings regarding this project

5. DISCREPANCIES should be reported in writing to the project architect or engineer immediately

MODEL FILE REFERENCE: 21010-A-P-PL

rev. description	date	by	checked
G Property access amended, legend & notes added	2023.01.09	dp	AJC
F Alderwood Consulting Root Protection Areas indicated	2021.12.22	dp	AJC
E Dwelling & Garage moved in response to RPA's	2021.12.21	dp	AJC
D Drawing file amended	2021.09.27	dp	AJC
C Drawing file amended	2021.09.27	dp	AJC
B Drawing sheet size and scale amended/ ditch indicated	2021.09.01	AJC	dp
A Planning issue	2021.08.24	AJC	dp

scale: 1:200 @ A1

client: Mr Russell Duke

date: August 2021

project: Land at Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD.

drawn: AJC

drawing: Indicative Proposed Layout

status: PLANNING

wessex house upper market street eastleigh hampshire SO50 9FD  
t: 01794 830660 e: enquiries@vision-architects.org.uk


**vision**  
architects

drawing No: 21010-A-PL-010 revision: G



**Legend:**

- Application Boundary
- Photograph Number & Direction
- Existing trees



0 10m 120m

**notes**

© Copyright Reserved

- This drawing is the copyright of vision architects limited
- DO NOT copy, alter or reproduced in any way or pass to a third party without written authority
- ~~DO NOT~~ - dimensions to be checked on site prior to commencing any work
- READ in conjunction with other Consultants documentation & drawings regarding this project
- DISCREPANCIES should be reported in writing to the project architect or engineer immediately

MODEL FILE REFERENCE 21010-A-P-PL

C Photographs, legend, dimensions & notes added 2023.09.01 dp AJC

B Drawing sheet size and scale amended/ ditch indicated 2021.09.01 AJC dp

A Planning Issue 2021.08.24 dp

rev. description date

scale: 1:200 @ A1

client: Mr Russell Duke

date: August 2021

project: Land at Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD.

drawing: Existing Site Plan

status: PLANNING

drawn: AJC

wessex house upper market street eastleigh hampshire SO50 9FD

t: 01794 830660 e: enquiries@vision-architects.org.uk

**vision**  
architects

drawing No: 21010-A-PL-005 revision: C





**Legend:**

Application Boundary

Existing tree, Tree Reference Number (eg T1) & Root Protection Area (RPA) shown in a dashed line

NOTE: Information copied from arboriculturalist drawing - refer to Alderwood Consultants Ltd original drawing



**notes**

1. This drawing is the copyright of **vision architects limited**

2. DO NOT copy, alter or reproduced in any way or pass to a third party without written authority

3. ~~DO NOT scale these drawings~~ - dimensions to be checked on site prior to commencing any work

4. READ in conjunction with other Consultants documentation & drawings regarding this project

5. DISCREPANCIES should be reported in writing to the project architect or engineer immediately

MODEL FILE REFERENCE: 21010-A-P-PL

rev. description	date	by	checked by
H Fire Tender access & turning illustrated at request of the Case Officer	2023.02.23	dp	AJC
G Property access amended, legend & notes added	2023.01.09	dp	AJC
F Alderwood Consulting Root Protection Areas indicated	2021.12.22	dp	AJC
E Dwelling & Garage moved in response to RPA's	2021.12.21	dp	AJC
D Drawing file amended	2021.09.27	dp	AJC
C Drawing file amended	2021.09.27	dp	AJC
B Drawing sheet size and scale amended/ ditch indicated	2021.09.01	AJC	dp
A Planning issue	2021.08.24	AJC	dp

scale: 1:200 @ A1

client: Mr Russell Duke

date: August 2021

project: Land at Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD.

drawn: AJC

drawing: Indicative Proposed Layout

status: PLANNING

wessex house upper market street eastleigh hampshire SO50 9FD  
t: 01794 830660 e: enquiries@vision-architects.org.uk

**vision**  
architects

drawing No: 21010-A-PL-010 revision: H