

---

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	20/03191/RESS
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	RESERVED MATTERS - SOUTH
<b>REGISTERED</b>	02.02.2021
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Wyatt Homes
<b>SITE</b>	Hoe Farm, Hoe Lane, North Baddesley, SO52 9NH, <b>NORTH BADDESLEY / NURSLING AND ROWNHAMS</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Parcel 2 - Reserved Matters for 16/02432/OUTS - Appearance, landscape, layout and scale for the erection of 93 homes with associated planting, hard- surfacing, parking provision, curtilages, open areas, vehicular and pedestrian routing within Parcel 2 of the Hoe Lane new neighbourhood area. The application includes details for discharge of the principal conditions relating to Reserved Matters i.e. 2 and 3 as well as content to discharge the following conditions in relation to this Parcel: 1 (parcel plan), 5 (materials), 6 (arboricultural information), 9 (biodiversity management), 10 (lighting), 13 (construction traffic and environmental management plan), 14 (disposal of foul and surface water), 15 (levels), 17 (roads for adoption), 18 (safety audits), and 20 (vehicle cleaning)
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	Amended Plans received 05.03.21
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Mr Paul Goodman

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Member for the reason that it raises issues of more than local public interest.

## 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is a broadly triangular shaped parcel of land situated to the southern side of Sylvan Drive and to the north of Hoe Lane. The site is situated on the southern edge of the settlement of North Baddesley and extends to approximately 16.4 hectares.
- 2.2 The proposal lies within the strategic allocation of Hoe Lane (Policy COM4 and map B) which is identified for approximately 300 dwellings. The outline permission (16/02432/OUTS) is for 300 dwellings.
- 2.3 Parcel 2 is broadly comprised of the northern side of the Outline site extending along the majority of the boundary with Mountbatten Park to the south and bordered by the other reserved matters areas to the west, south and east.

### 3.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 Reserved Matters for 16/02432/OUTS - Appearance, landscape, layout and scale for the erection of 93 homes with associated planting, hard-surfacing, parking provision, curtilages, open areas, vehicular and pedestrian routing within Parcel 1 of the Hoe Lane new neighbourhood area.
- 3.2 The application also includes details for discharge of the details reserved by conditions specifically in relation to this Parcel: 1 (parcel plan), 5 (materials), 6 (arboricultural information), 9 (biodiversity management), 10 (lighting), 13 (construction traffic and environmental management plan), 14 (disposal of foul and surface water), 15 (levels), 17 (roads for adoption), 18 (safety audits), and 20 (vehicle cleaning). However some of these conditions have subsequently been withdrawn and details are provided below.

### 4.0 **HISTORY**

- 4.1 16/02432/OUTS - Outline application for up to 300 dwellings with associated open space, roads, parking, service infrastructure, allotments and landscaping and potential for ancillary uses including employment, retail and health provision; along with the creation of new vehicular access points to Hoe Lane and Sylvan Drive. Outline Permission 02.02.2021.

### 5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

- 5.1 **Planning & Building (Trees)** – No comments received at the time of reporting.
- 5.2 **Planning & Building (Landscape)** – Objection:

#### Tree Pits

- Tree pit details need to be specific for each tree as each has different requirements to allow substantial and sufficient rooting areas in order to establish well and thrive in the long term More hard landscape layout details required

#### Buildings

- There are a mix of heritage style dwellings set close to the roads with some on plot and some rear courtyard parking. The mix is good to break up the scheme, but they do not represent a typology or common building type seen in the closest village area of North Baddesley. The site is a new character of its own.

#### Parking Courts

- Still not a favoured layout - residents are likely to park on street where possible and parking courts often become underused spaces. The Partnership intend to control this with their own arrangements, however it should be noted that it is not a desired design element.

#### Lighting

- There is no lighting apparently proposed in parking courts yet there are trees proposed – it is likely that residents using these areas would favour the safety of some lighting especially where tree may add shading in less well used backstreet areas. Low level such as bollards may be preferable.

### Parking Courts

- Trees in parking courts may give rise to leaf litter and other drop issues – consider use of car ports near trees.

### Planting

- Several incredibly small areas proposed for planting - this is a very 'built' environment with walls, footpaths, drives, roads dwellings etc. – by the time there is a house foundation, footpath edging/haunching and subbase all around some areas will be virtually un-plantable with minimal rooting area to achieve some of these proposals.

### Street planting

- We welcome a different approach to the StreetSide planting generally, however some species are not suited to be close to the main through fare and will require extensive management not suited to the plant type – i.e. dog rose rosa canina planted in informal garden hedge species. Also Cynara scolymus- globe artichoke can grow up to 6ft tall and will lean into the street potentially causing an issue. It is more of a deep border plant. Olives kept as shrubs and outside in beds are less likely to actually produce fruit.
- Yorkstone is recognised as a high quality material, however Yorkstone is not a local vernacular paving material – it is sometimes found in historic villages in parts or in established town or village centres with heritage connections – it can be used to highlight new public spaces of interest i.e. shopping areas or churches. It is not usually used in general domestic settings for streets. It gives an impression of a historic street. Its use should be considered and appropriate to the site and setting.

### The Square

- In the sketch book it has a sketch – there is not sufficient detail in the landscape plan of the hard landscaping in the square – what is the different paving, what edges will be used ie soldier course to buildings.
- B82-87 in the square is a large and prominent building set into a semi-formal paved area of with a public walkway through to B60-B57 lane (no turning space) and a drive over this space to B 82-87's courtyard parking. The space serves little public purpose as it is a private driveway and there is little defensive space between the properties frontage and access.
- This paved area again would appear to be a central hub for a shop or public area in design but actually is private residential.
- It is large public area not visually softened with the exception one Elm tree in views from the west.

5.3 **Planning & Building (Ecology)** – No comments received at the time of reporting.

5.4 **Housing & Environmental Health (Housing)** – No objection, following receipt of additional information.

**5.5 Community & Leisure (Health Promotion) – Comment;**

- A management plan will be required for the various areas of POS so this can be monitored. The plan should include maintenance and inspection of all elements including proposed frequencies of operations and an outline schedule for capital replacement.

**5.6 Environmental Services (Refuse) – No objection**

**5.7 Highways – No objection;**

- Additional information submitted by the applicant has been reviewed. It is considered that in regard to the purposes of reserved matters the proposed layout is considered to be broadly acceptable, and no highway safety objections are raised to the proposal subject to review of the above outstanding concerns.
- The applicant should continue to note that there are a number of concerns that still exist in how they are likely to pertain to full s.38 adoption and this issues will be reviewed during any subsequent S.38 submission coming forward.
- Condition 13 – CEMP – The details and correspondence as now submitted is considered to be satisfactory. As such the condition can be discharged.
- Condition 18 – Stage 1 Road Safety Audit – Given the details provided and further RSA Stages will be required as part of any formal S.38 submission coming forward, the condition can be discharged.
- Condition 20 – Details sufficient. Condition can be discharged.
- Condition 17 (Roads for adoption) – Given the issues raised that cannot be sufficiently dealt with until a formal S.38 submission is provided, the Condition cannot not be discharged.

**5.8 HCC Lead Local Flood Authority - We require this further information before we can make a decision on whether to recommend to the Local Planning Authority that planning permission is granted.**

**5.9 TVBC Design Review Panel**

- As a general comment the panel considered this was an unusually well considered housing scheme resulting in a layout that promises to deliver an interesting and satisfying conclusion. With a continued interest being taken by the current land owner, there is therefore a good chance that both the design and landscape discipline proposed will be maintained.

There are a number of queries which the Design review Panel felt required further explanation which are as follows:-

Landscape

Whilst the edible landscape ethos is welcomed, it is a difficult strategy to pursue when much of the planting is within the private domain and at the mercy of the homeowner, it would be useful to understand how this has successfully worked in schemes elsewhere, as the applicant has suggested would be possible.

### Lighting

Low lighting levels have been designed in, however it did not seem clear as to how this was to be achieved.

### Parking and vehicle movement

The road layouts were narrower than usual which is commendable, but it was not clear how to prevent parking taking place which if allowed could be a major nuisance to traffic attempting to pass. We also were uncertain about pavement finishes, the road materials were clearly identified but there appeared to be no reference to pavement finishes to the brick paved road areas.

### Bicycles.

Garages are planned to allow for bicycle storage, it is not clear where storage is not allowed for, how such store facilities are provided.

### Wildlife.

There is a wide variety of bird life spread over the current land area, is it considered that the bird population has been adequately catered for within the new development proposal?

### Fencing

The police are concerned that some areas appear unprotected and suggest a 1.8 meter high fencing is provided, this is obviously not in the design philosophy, Is the criticism justified and can the recommendation be handled in a more sensitive fashion?

### Bins

It would be helpful to understand how the refuse bin strategy works for both storage and collection to give the panel confidence that parking courts will be bin free, and that house-holder views will not be spoilt.

### Design and Community Code

The D and C code was discussed and we understood that this was in production. If possible the panel would wish to see this. The panel considered the code should be added into the application information.

### Properties Environmental Performance.

A fabric first approach to the properties performance was stated. It was disappointing that the opportunity to take the buildings environmental performance further had not been taken. Recommend that consideration be given to improve this aspect of this scheme.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 31.03.2021

6.1 **North Baddesley Parish Council – Objection;**

### Affordable Housing Provision

- In the Adopted Local Plan and confirmed in the Sept 2020 Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document from TVBC, the starting point for affordable housing provision should be 70% Affordable and Social rented and 30% intermediate housing. On the current split for parcel 1 there are 22 properties for rent and 21 for shared ownership or DMS, giving a 51%/49% split. More affordable properties in the parcel need to be offered for rent rather than purchase.
- The developer has an obligation to ensure that there is appropriate integration of privately owned and affordable properties. The decision to give all 3 and 4 bed privately owned houses a garage while not providing a garage or driveway to even the bigger 4 bed affordable properties will create a clear and obvious difference between the two types of housing which should be avoided.

### Arboricultural Assessment and Method Statement

- P6 states: "Mountbatten Park is owned by the Parish Council but will be managed jointly with The Ashfield Estate." No legal agreement has yet been concluded between the parish council and the Ashfield Estates.

### Visitor Parking

- There appear to be only 2 visitor parking spaces. A lack of visitor parking will lead to cars being parked in the narrow roads blocking access for larger vehicles.
- As this area has relatively poor public transport it is unrealistic to expect many visitors to arrive by public transport, and every property can be expected to have at least two cars.
- Lack of visitor parking also regularly leads to disputes between neighbours where there are large amounts of allocated parking, as there are in this parcel.

6.2 **Nursling & Rownhams Parish Council** – No comment.

6.3 **11 representations of Objection received;**

### Principle of Development

- No need for further development in North Baddesley.
- Any housing need should be met on brownfield sites.
- Impact of development and additional population on climate change.
- The number of houses at the Luzborough development could be subtracted from the number to be built at Hoe Lane.

### Character and Appearance

- Overdevelopment of the village
- The design concept for the development is not suited to North Baddesley which is a suburban dormitory village. The concept is for an urban development, more suited to the centre of a town or city.

- The design of the houses is distinctly different from anything else in North Baddesley. Most existing properties, detached and semi-detached houses, terraces and bungalows, are set back from the road with front gardens. The character of the new properties as shown on these plans does not fit in at all.
- North Baddesley is not a town or city, and the streets and houses in this design are not suitable for a site in fields and trees on the very edge of a village.
- The Green may have drawn inspiration from the centres of some traditional Hampshire settlements, but North Baddesley is not one of those.
- Edible streets will degrade in 5 years and beyond when things have died, or outgrown their spaces.
- The Neighbourhood will look out of character with all the different designs and materials compared to the majority of houses in Baddesley which are the standard red brick and tile roof. The positioning makes it look like it is not part of the village being separated by the woods.
- Concern with regard to the sustainability and maintenance of hardwood windows.
- The proposed plans for the site appear to be a design for an urban development. Whilst surrounded by green space (farmland, wooded parkland, country lane) the development has little in the way of pavements and many properties are at significant distance from the planned green space.
- Development is out of character with develops with large green spaces or where access to green spaces is limited (e.g. Ringwood Drive and Cedar Crescent developments), significant inclusion of grassed areas within the pavement/road boundaries. The development has little in the way of front gardens.
- Examples of local vernacular are provided for aspects of the development. However, noticeable by its absence is any example in a rural development of narrow continuous street lines with housings abutting the pavements.

#### Landscape Character & Arboriculture

- Landscape belts along the Western and Southern edges have not been retained in the current plans and housing is denser with fewer open spaces.
- The explanation by the developers that changing these aspects of the development will improve the design is disingenuous. (See Design and Planning Statements on reserved matters applications) There is a significant financial motivation for the developer to favour this new design as it allows more land to be developed and sold. The idea followed by TVBC throughout has been to maintain the character of Hoe Lane as a rural lane.
- Concern with regard to the impact of parking spaces on tree roots.
- The entire premise for the development rests on the absence of any maintenance to combined operations wood and to the trees west of Mountbatten park. The Applicants have also failed to maintain trees along Hoe Lane over the past 10 years.

- A5 (Parcel 1/4) Elevation 1 shows a hedge in front of the buildings facing onto Hoe Lane. The height of the hedges appears to be approx. 1m. This is going to result in significant light pollution from these buildings onto Hoe Lane, and a break in the present hedgerow which is currently over 2m high along this stretch of the verge.
- Parcel 4: Allotment landscaping - the significant existing tree in the north-west corner of the allotments is not shown on this plan, nor is the tree immediately to the west of it. The Applicants' intentions regarding these trees should be clarified.

#### Affordable Housing

- Proposed tenures should favour affordable rent rather than shared ownership.
- Affordable properties will be distinguishable by the lack of garages for 4 bedroom dwellings.
- Concern that properties will not be truly affordable.
- Throughout the parcels of land, the proportion of affordable housing is lower than expected.

#### Highways

- Traffic impact has not been properly addressed.
- Highways safety concerns resulting from narrow roads and on-street parking.
- Stated reductions in driving and favouring walking will not be achieved.
- Refuse collection will not be manageable in the proposed layout.
- Increase in traffic, especially along Hoe Lane. A single track with passing places would be insufficient for the increased volume of traffic.
- No reference to electronic vehicle charging.
- On-street parking will block access to emergency vehicles.
- Development will result in increased on-street parking on Hoe Lane restricting access to passing places.
- Restrictions from the outline development on the provision of passing places and the route of HGV's should be upheld.
- The Applicants must therefore provide as discussed in the consultation, an off-road connection suitable for cyclists to travel from the new development to Mountbatten school in order to mitigate traffic on the surrounding roads.
- HGV vehicle movements should therefore be prohibited during peak hours, including during the school run (8.15-9am, 2.30-3.45pm).
- Swept path analysis for vehicles travelling in both directions via the mini-roundabout should be provided.
- Contractors should not park on Hoe Lane and Sylvan Drive. The Applicants must commit to this in a concrete manner (shall/must, etc., not should/may.) and confirm that parking for construction traffic will be provided on site.
- Swept-path figures show low-loader leaving the site and heading west on Hoe Lane, contrary to the 7.5t limit on Hoe Lane.

- The passing places on Hoe Lane have been proposed in order to facilitate traffic flow along Hoe Lane. Contractors must therefore be required to not allow parking on Hoe Lane, particularly within the passing places.
- Inadequate visitor parking spaces.

#### Drainage

- Concern that development will result in runoff water that will cause flooding in winter as this area is very wet and already is subject to drainage problems.
- There is no provision for draining surface water which runs from the fields south of Hoe Lane (from its junction with Sylvan Drive and the eastern-most development access) onto the development site at its eastern-most access. At this point, the ditches regularly fill up causing water to flow north over the road and onto the development site.

#### Neighbouring Amenity

- Impact of odours from pumping station.
- Impact on residents light from large trees on the Hoe Lane boundary.
- Restrictions on the hours of construction and piling operations should be applied.
- Light pollution from development.
- In Parcel 2 narrow streets and absence of front garden spaces mean that there is a significant degree of overlooking of houses on opposite sides of a street. The same applies to buildings in different parcels which face the same road.

#### Other Matters

- Unsupervised children's play areas will be subject to antisocial behaviour.
- How will the Design and Community code be enforced.
- How is the Residents Association to be organised and who will it consist of.
- How are the developers going to mitigate the inevitable damage to the environment so that the number and variety of species of birds currently found there will not be compromised.
- Concern with regard to the use of wood burners on all properties.
- Properties accessed through parking areas will result in antisocial behaviour.
- There is no informal open space close to the A5 portion. It is over 150m walk to Mountbatten Park, and there will be no opportunities for neighbours to 'accidentally' meet when out and about, or for the possibility of children to play with others near to their home.
- Object to the number of documents to have to try to read through in the plan. It is obstructive and unfortunately this means that most of the general public will not comment.
- Lighting should be provided for the paths to the immediate west of the ponds, and within combined operations wood for public safety.

## 7.0 **POLICY**

### 7.1 **National Planning Policy Framework 2019**

7.2 **Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016** - COM2 (Settlement Hierarchy), COM4 (New Neighbourhood at Hoe Lane, North Baddesley), COM9 (Community Led Development), 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), E9 (Heritage), LHW1 (Public Open Space), LHW4 (Amenity), T1 (Managing Movement), T2 (Parking Standard), CS1 (Community Safety).

7.3 **Supplementary Planning Documents** - Affordable Housing.

## 8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main planning considerations are whether the details proposed for approval are acceptable and in accordance with both the terms of the outline planning permission and the policies of the development plan.

### 8.1 **Principle of Development**

The principle of development was established by the decision on the outline application (16/02432/OUTS). The outline permission also approved the details of the access to the site and as a result consideration of the current application is limited to the reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

8.2 As is indicated above the application also includes details for discharge of details reserved by conditions. Specifically in relation to Conditions: 1 (parcel plan), 5 (materials), 6 (arboricultural information), 9 (biodiversity management), 10 (lighting), 13 (construction traffic and environmental management plan), 14 (disposal of foul and surface water), 15 (levels), 17 (roads for adoption), 18 (safety audits), and 20 (vehicle cleaning). However some of these conditions have subsequently been withdrawn and details are provided for each individual below and separately form the consideration of the reserved matters.

### 8.3 **Consideration of the reserved matters**

#### 8.4 **Layout**

An illustrative site layout was provided at the outline planning stage to demonstrate that the number of properties sought could be provided on site. Supporting documentation to the outline application also suggested indicative building heights across the site to guide the final details. This illustrative layout was not detailed with regard to plot subdivisions or parking layouts and in granting outline permission no condition to require the development to be undertaken in substantial accordance with the illustrative layout was applied.

- 8.5 Policy E1 of the RLP seeks to ensure the delivery of high quality development in the Borough, stating that development will be permitted if it is of a high quality of design and local distinctiveness and sets a number of criteria against which proposals will be assessed. These include the need to 'integrate, respect and complement the character of the area, in terms of layout, appearance, scale, materials and building styles', amongst others.
- 8.6 The layout proposes 300no dwellings, with a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties throughout the site. Parcel 2 include the largest development of flats and the largest building on the site at Plots 82-85. Parcel 2 does not include any of the access points from the existing public highways which were permitted at the outline stage.
- 8.7 The proposed layout follows the overarching design principles across the site but does contain some individual elements resulting from the different developer's proposals and the site specific constraints. As noted above parcel 2 contains the single largest building. This building is situated on the southern side of Parcel 2 but centrally within the wider site and adjacent the central green area. As a result the location is considered suitable for this more prominent building.
- 8.8 Parcel 2 borders Mountbatten Park for most of its southern boundary with site. Mountbatten Park is a public park owned by the Parish Council and it is understood that discussions are ongoing with the applicant regarding further enhancements to this area. The proposed layout with the new dwellings facing towards the boundary of the site with Mountbatten Park is considered to be the preferable layout option.
- 8.9 Whilst the local environment will be visually changed, the overall density of the site for 300 dwellings, and the specific layout of Parcel 2, remains in line with the allocation and outline permission is considered to represent a suitable arrangement to provide for the number of dwellings required. There is no doubt that the proposed development does not seek to replicate the existing development in North Baddesley which has been the subject of many of the representations received. However North Baddesley is not considered to have a unifying character. The village does not have a traditional core. Whilst the bulk of the commercial premises, one school and the primary recreation ground are broadly situated around the junctions of Botley Road with Rownhams Road and Castle Lane, the older development in the village is more focused to ribbons either side of Rownhams Lane, mostly at the northern end. The remainder of, what is now, a notable large village has been developed in a series of quite large scale residential developments. Each of these expansions has its own character reflective of the design philosophy employed at the time.

- 8.10 Specific reference has been drawn to the closest developments to the application site on the south/west side of the village. These developments themselves have considerable variety in their character. Ringwood Park is predominantly semi-detached properties of a unified design. Many of the properties are bungalows and the main ring road of Ringwood Drive is characterised by wide grassed verges. This development is undoubtedly spacious in its character. However replication at a similar density on the application site is not realistic in order to provide the allocated number of dwellings and in a modern context could reasonably be considered under development of the site. The newer development to the east of Sylvan Drive is generally far denser and comprised of predominantly two-storey properties. Whilst properties mostly have some front garden space it is generally much shorter and any grassed verges are limited. The overall density of this development is far closer to the proposed site than the older development in Ringwood Park and farther east within the village. As a general trend newer developments within the wider village (North of Nutburn Road, Former Bordon site) are denser than the older development within the village.
- 8.11 Further comments on the detailed design of properties is provided below but as was identified by the Design Review Panel the proposed layout is considered to represent an “unusually well considered housing scheme resulting in a layout that promises to deliver an interesting and satisfying conclusion”. The relative position of each plot next to its proposed neighbour(s), and other natural features on site is considered acceptable and would not give rise to a detrimental impact on the amenity or living conditions of future occupiers or compromise the development provide for by the outline permission.
- 8.12 Affordable Housing  
The application is supported by a plan showing the location and tenure split. Amended plans have been received in order to provide the required floor areas for wheelchair units. The final details of the floor plans are subject to approval under building regulation M4(3) which is secured via the legal agreement on the outline permission. Following the receipt of amended plans providing alterations to the floor plans of the proposed wheelchair units the Housing Officer has raised no objection the layout of affordable dwellings which comply with policy COM7 and the limitations in the legal agreement regarding clustering
- 8.13 **Appearance and scale**  
As a result of the existing site being an open field there is no overriding character or scale within the site. The southern side of Hoe Lane is characterised by sporadic existing detached properties of a traditional design and some farm buildings both historic and more modern construction. The modern agricultural buildings will be removed as part of the proposals whilst the more historic farm area is outside of the current reserved matters applications.

- 8.14 The detailed designs propose a number of different house types, incorporating a mix of materials, creating interest, rhythm and vibrancy within the resulting street scene. The house designs proposed are more traditional in their proportions and details than some of the older residential extensions within North Baddesley but the scale of the dwellings and the pallet of materials for the most part will ensure a sympathetic appearance to the proposed development in what will be very limited views through the site to nearby developments. The scale and proportion of the proposed units is considered appropriate in relation to existing properties in the vicinity and new developments. Concern has been raised by representations that the proposals do not replicate the design character of the other residential developments within North Baddesley. However, as identified above, the previous urban extensions do not have a unified character and in principle replication of the existing would not benefit the site.
- 8.15 Overall, the proposed development is considered to have a notably high standard of design for the dwellings as is reflected in the Design Review Panel comments. The proposals, both within the parcel and combined with the other parcels, include a far wider variety and quality of house designs than seen on a typical modern development. In addition the proposed materials, including timber windows and door, and natural locally sourced bricks/tiles are of a notably high quality. The proposed dwellings make the most of the significant natural assets of the site. The mature trees provide an attractive backdrop and setting for the new housing, as well as a degree of natural screening in terms of the surrounding area. As such, the proposals are considered to comply with Policy E1 of the RLP.
- 8.16 **Landscape**  
The site is relatively open, with a number of large mature trees around the site boundaries which make a significant contribution to the character of the site itself and are of considerable visual importance in views towards the site within the surrounding area. Parcel 1 is situated adjacent the Mountbatten Park at the northern end and adjacent Hoe Lane and its older mature trees to the south.
- 8.17 The need to respect and retain the mature trees in and around the site was a key consideration in designing the layout of the proposed housing. The layout shows the retention of the significant existing trees and areas of hedging around the site boundaries. Parcel 1 does however contain the area of plantation woodland to be cleared at its northern end. Smaller areas of open space are also shown adjacent to the tree belt between the site and Mountbatten Park and adjacent the access to the SANG. Roads are mostly aligned to allow clear views of the trees around the site and providing a back drop for the proposed housing. Similarly, the trees along the southern boundary, new planting to the west and woodland to the north provide a back drop to the new housing, providing a sense of setting for the site and a natural screen

- 8.18 As is identified in the supporting information within the scheme, aside from the existing trees which are retained, the proposed landscaping is focused on useful rather than ornamental planting in the public realm. The supporting information identifies this approach as 'edible streets'. This philosophy extends to front garden areas which are populated by soft fruit, nuts, herbs and perennial vegetables. Other planting within the public spaces and courtyards is identified as espalier or open grown fruit and nut trees.
- 8.19 Whilst the Landscape Officer has generally welcomed the different approach to the street side planting, concerns have been raised in regard to some specific species used in street planting and with parking courts. Whilst the applicant has defended use of many of the proposed species based on experience of other sites they have proposed a number of compromises to species which are currently under consideration by the Landscape Officer. Members will be updated further at SAPC.
- 8.20 Both the Design Review Panel, the Landscape Officer and public representations have commented on the suitability and future management of the proposed edible streets planting philosophy. The applicants have provided some further detail of how the planting will be managed through a Design and Community Code. Alongside other matters the Code also deals with planting within garden areas, protection of included plants, and replacement procedure. The Code is prescriptive but the applicant has advised that use of edible planting has proved popular in other legacy developments
- 8.21 The Landscape Officer has also raised specific concern regarding the restricted spaces available for planting in some areas. The applicants have advised that based on experience of other developments the methodology adopted will enable successful strips of planting in the narrow spaces adjacent buildings and boundary walls.
- 8.22 Specifically in relation to Parcel 2 the Landscape Officer has raised concern that the paved area to the west of the central block of flats is large public area not visually softened with the exception one Elm tree in views from the west. However this area is bordered to the east by the central green space and the large mature Oak trees. The single tree to the east is likely the largest new tree on the site and the provision of an area of hardstanding in this central area is not considered to be out of character.
- 8.23 Following the submission of a revised tree survey and arboricultural method statement following the outline application and pre-application discussions parts of the layout have been amended in response to the Tree Officers advice to increase separation from trees. Details of the revised report and protection measures are considered under condition (6) of the outline permission and discussed in detail below. In terms of the proposed landscape reserved matters this development can proceed without significant detriment to the existing trees or the proposed new trees.

- 8.24 Similar to the overall layout the landscape approach to the site is not typical of large modern developments. However the proposals have clearly been developed in coordination with the layout of the dwellings and with reference to the surrounding landscape character. In terms of the residential areas the proposals are consistent across the three parcels and will provide a unified character to the development. Notwithstanding any consideration of alternative species in a few areas the proposals are considered to compliment the overall design and the details submitted for consideration with the reserved matters application are considered to accord with the requirements of policy E2.
- 8.25 **Residential Amenity**  
Policy LHW4 of the RLP sets a number of criteria against which development proposals will be assessed in order to safeguard the amenity of existing and future residents, particularly in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy and any adverse impact in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight.
- 8.26 In terms of the potential for overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking and loss of privacy to the proposed properties, the layout achieves acceptable separation distances between the rear/side elevations of the proposed houses within the development.
- 8.27 The proposed scheme would retain appropriate separation distances and intervening vegetation on the boundaries. As a result it is considered that there will not be an adverse impact on the residential amenities of the off-site neighbouring properties. Noise impacts are suitably controlled during construction works by condition on the outline permission. The resultant development is considered to comply with policies LHW4 and E8 of the TVBLP.
- 8.28 **Community Safety**  
The Hampshire Police Designing Out Crime Officer has raised concerns in relation to Parcels 1 and 3 but has not commented on Parcel 2. However given the similarity and overarching design approach it is assumed that similar concerns would be raised in relation to Parcel 2. In relation to the other parcels general concerns were raised in relation to the design proposed and made specific reference to some individual plots. In general terms the principle areas of concern are the permeability and access to the rear of dwelling from parking courts, and access to elevations from the public realm. On this point the response advocates that the private space to the rear of the dwellings must be enclosed by a robust boundary treatment at least 1.8m high and that the semi-private space to the front and side front of the dwelling must be enclosed within a robust boundary treatment 1m high.
- 8.29 Policy CS1 (Community Safety) states that development will be permitted provided that it delivers safe, accessible and liveable environments and that the design takes account of the need to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour. The supporting text further states that;

“The designing-out of crime should not be the only consideration of new development but part of the overall process of achieving good design with adjoining land uses. The relationship between buildings, spaces, boundary treatments and transport infrastructure such as footways, cycleways and car parks is important and can influence the way the public use them. Opportunities for passive surveillance of public spaces and appropriate lighting should be incorporated into schemes as this may encourage greater use. Careful design should seek to minimise potential conflict between users. For example layouts should provide a clear distinction between public and private spaces. These measures all help to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.”

- 8.30 In this case it is difficult to apply a standardised approach to crime prevention to the design of the application site. The permeability of the rear parking courts is a feature of the development. These areas are not similar to some other less successful parking court arrangements and are subject to considerable passive surveillance from the proposed dwellings which is clearly advocated elsewhere in the comments in relation to areas of public open space as being the best approach to prevent crime.
- 8.31 With regard to boundary treatments, all rear boundaries are enclosed by either brick walls of 1.8m, 2.1m or 2.5m heights on public facing boundaries and 1.8m close board boundary fences to private boundaries. In addition many of the front gardens, predominantly on the outer edges of the site, are enclosed by lower fences or railings. There are however areas within the site where front gardens are not enclosed and side elevations are immediately adjacent pavements. To enforce boundary treatments on those elevation would significantly detract from the character of the site and its overall design approach. The desire to design out potential crime must be balanced against the creation of an attractive development. It is considered that the most significant elements to secure individual properties and passive surveillance of public spaces have been achieved. To accommodate all the recommendations of the Designing Out Crime Officer would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the development and the current balanced approach is considered an appropriate arrangement.
- 8.32 **Highways**  
Access to the site was granted detailed permission at the outline stage and the outline permission also included a number of detailed highways conditions which are discussed in more detail below. In terms of the reserved matters consideration is limited to the internal highways layout and parking arrangements.
- 8.33 The Highways Officers response to the original submission raised a number of detailed issues. In summary, other than some very specific instances requiring further amendment, those issues have been resolved as summarised below.

- 8.34 The applicant has provided confirmation that all internal garages are provided with a minimum of 6m x 3m internal space. All parallel parking bays are 6m in length and visitor parking has now been amended upon the submitted plans and is now clearly identified. An issue was raised in regard to gates associated B89 – B92. The gates have now been removed.
- 8.35 There is one area of detail which remains unresolved at the time of reporting. Specifically relating to parking bays B44 and B41. The applicant has provided an amended layout and associated tracking and whilst the layout would appear to be broadly acceptable, the tracking is overlaid and as such is impossible to determine the proposed manoeuvres. Individual tracking for each of the spaces (41) is required. Tracking associated with B44 also illustrates the vehicle striking boundary walls which is unacceptable.
- 8.36 It is anticipated that these matters will be resolved prior to SAPC and members will be updated at committee. Subject to the successful resolution parking provision with the parcel will accord with Policy T2 of the TVBRLP.
- 8.37 On a broader level applicant has sought to provide further details of design thesis/methodology behind the layout pertaining to looking to reduce vehicle speeds through design rather than traffic calming measures. HCC Highways have confirmed that for purposes of reserved matters, the design can be considered as being broadly acceptable without posing a significant risk to highway safety. However the Highways Officer has also advised that some specific areas would not be unlikely to be suitable for adoption as public highway. Any areas proposed to be adopted would be subject to further approval under the full S.38 Audit process with HCC Highways.
- 8.38 Whilst the Highways advice is that the reserved matters submission is acceptable the application also includes consideration of planning condition 17 of the outline permission. Condition 17 relates to the submission of details of those roads to be adopted as public highways. Given the uncertainty of the future adoption of some areas this condition cannot be approved at this time. Condition details will need to be resubmitted once the extent of adoption is resolved through the s.38 process with HCC.
- 8.39 Other Highways Matters  
Representations have referred to a number of matters including off-site highways impacts, cycle routes and contractor parking. These matters were all subject to consideration at the outline stage and are subject to a number of conditions and legal agreement obligations attached to that permission. They do not however form material considerations in relation to the reserved matters application and cannot be taken into account. However some elements do form part of the highways condition approvals considered below.
- 8.40 **Consideration of condition details**  
For member information the some of the condition details cover all 4 development parcels within the same plans and reports. There are however some details that are specific to each parcel and they are noted individually were relevant.

8.41 Condition 1 - Parcel Plan

Condition 1 requires the submission of a plan showing the extent of each parcel prior to the commencement of development. The parcel plan has been provided and the details are recommended for approval.

8.42 Condition 5 – Materials

Condition 5 requires the submission of details and samples of materials to be approved prior to development above DPC level. As noted above the plans do include details of materials which are of a generally very high quality. However samples are not currently available for approval and in order that the reserved matters can progress this condition submission have been withdrawn. The details will need to be the subject of a separate condition approval application.

8.43 Condition 6 - Updated Arboricultural Method Statement

Condition 6 required the submission of updated tree works/protection details to the original tree information which was undertaken in 2016. The revised details have been received and are recommended for approval.

8.44 Condition 9 - Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP)

Condition 9 required the submission of a detailed Biodiversity Management Plan for the site. The required BMP has been submitted and is recommended for approval.

8.45 Condition 10 – Lighting

Condition 19 requires the submission of a detailed lighting strategy, including within the site and new street lighting. Details of the street lighting strategy have been submitted and are recommended for approval. In response to the comments on lighting of parking courts further details could be submitted under this condition in an additional application.

8.46 Condition 13 – Construction Environment Plan

Condition 13 required the submission of details of a construction environment plan. The initial concerns raised by HCC as the Highways Authority have been resolved and the details are recommended for approval.

8.47 Condition 14 – Drainage

Condition 14 required the submission of surface water drainage details. The application was supported by details but HCC as the LLFA have requested further detailed calculations. Further details have been provided and the comments of the LLFA are awaited at the time of reporting.

8.48 Condition 15 - Levels

Condition 15 required the submission of details of existing and proposed land levels in relation to the finished floor levels of the dwellings. The details have been provided and are recommended for approval.

8.49 Condition 17 – Adopted Highways

Condition 17 required the submission of details of those roads to be offered for adoption. The application was supported by details but HCC as the Highways Authority have raised concerns. It has not been possible to provide/consider further details in the require timeframe and this condition has been withdrawn and will need to be subject to a further separate application for approval.

8.50 Condition 18 – Highways Safety Audit

Condition 18 required the submission of a Stage 1 Safety Audit. The initial concerns raised by HCC as the Highways Authority have been resolved and the details are recommended for approval.

8.51 Condition 20

Condition 20 required the submission of details of a wheel washing arrangements to avoid the spread of dirt onto the highway during construction. The required details are included within the Construction Environment Plan and are recommended for approval.

9.0 **CONCLUSION ON RESERVED MATTERS**

9.1 Outline planning permission has been granted at this site for residential development, with this reserved matters submission seeking to provide a development of a layout scale and appearance appropriate to the character of the area. The proposal is therefore deemed acceptable for reserved matters approval.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION ON RESERVED MATTERS**

**APPROVAL** subject to:

1. **The development is to be carried out in accordance with the schedule of approved plans ref (TBC)**  
**Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper Planning.**
2. **Notwithstanding the details shown on plans 83\_DI\_19.1\_LD05 and 083\_DI\_20.1\_LD06 no new tree planting within a Development Parcel shall take place until an updated tree pit detail for each species has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that Parcel. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.**  
**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.**

**Notes to applicant:**

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and completed strictly in accordance with the submitted plans, specifications and written particulars for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.**

2. 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.

#### 11.0 RECOMMENDATION ON CONDITION DETAILS

1. Approval of details re: Condition 1 (Development Parcel Plan) in accordance with Plan ref PH-101 Rev B.
  5. WITHDRAWN
  6. Approval of details re: Condition 6 (Arboricultural Method Statement) in accordance with Arboricultural assessment & method statement Ref 18266-AA2-DC (Barrell 8th December 2020) and Plan ref 18266-BT2.
  9. Approval of details re: Condition 9 (Biodiversity Management Plan) in accordance with Biodiversity Management Plan CG Fry Housing Parcel Ref 11/44Y-2C (EPR, 9<sup>th</sup> December 2020).
  10. Approval of details re: Condition 10 (Lighting) in accordance with Street Lighting Strategy Ref 4212 (illuminate DESIGN, 9th December 2020) and Plans ref 4212-ID-DR-1001, 4212-ID-DR-1003 and 4212-ID-DR-1004.
  13. Approval of details re: Condition 13 (Construction Environment Management Plan) in accordance with Construction Environment Management Plan (awp, Dec 2020).
  14. PENDING CONSIDERATION
  15. Approval of details re: Condition 15 (Levels) in accordance with plan ref PHL-801, PHL-802 Rev A and PHL-803 Rev A.
  17. WITHDRAWN
  18. Approval of details re: Condition 18 (Stage 1 Safety Audit) in accordance with Road Safety Audit Stage 1 Ref 04/250 (Hampshire Services, Dec 2019).
  20. Approval of details re: Condition 20 (Wheel Washing) in accordance with Construction Environment Management Plan (awp, Dec 2020).
-