
APPLICATION NO.	19/01779/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	18.07.2019
APPLICANT	Mr R Carter, Millgate (Winchester) Ltd
SITE	Land East Of Muss Lane, Kings Somborne, Stockbridge, SO20 6PE, KINGS SOMBORNE
PROPOSAL	Erection of 4 no. detached houses (3 x 4 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom) together with new access, parking, garages, landscaping and associated works
AMENDMENTS	ASHP info – Various dates Ecology / nitrate information – Various dates Construction management information – Various dates Amended and additional information – 15.10.2019 Additional drawings - 20.08.2019
CASE OFFICER	Sarah Barter

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Local Ward Councillor due to the public interest in the application.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The site is within the settlement boundary of King's Somborne and within the King's Somborne Conservation Area. The site is on land to the east side of Muss Lane to the rear of existing dwellings, Harvest Cottage, Marfield and Samphia. There is an existing access track to the land between Marfield and Samphia proposed to be used for the purposes of this application.

3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is for four detached dwellings, including 3 four bedroom and 1 three bedroom dwelling, with a new access off Muss Lane. Each house would be provided with its own garage and parking spaces together with private amenity space.
- 3.2 This application follows a previous withdrawn application detailed below in paragraph 4.1. The dwelling number has reduced from 5 to 4 with the size of the dwellings also reduced. Larger gardens are provided at each plot with revised designs creating more variation through the elevations with red multi brick and hanging tiles proposed. The access has also been moved away from the front of the neighbouring Grade 2 Listed Cottages.

4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 18/03347/FULLS - Erection of 5 no. 4 bedroom dwellings, with associated access, parking, and landscaping – Withdrawn - 15.02.2019.

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

- 5.1 Conservation – No Objection subject to conditions
- 5.2 Landscape – No objection subject to conditions
- 5.3 Highways – No Objection
- 5.4 Ecology – No Objection (following receipt of reptile information)
- 5.5 Natural England – No Objection subject to securing appropriate mitigation
- 5.6 Refuse – No Objection (Following receipt of bin store and access information)
- 5.7 Trees – No objection subject to condition
- 5.8 Environmental Protection – Comment
Clarification required on ASHP locations (update to follow)
- 5.9 Archaeology – No Comment

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 12.03.2021

- 6.1 Kings Somborne PC – Objection – Response 30.1.2019
- Two members of the public spoke to report their concerns. Whilst they were happier with the improved design of the houses it was noted that house H4 did not have a hipped roof and would therefore not fit in sympathetically with surrounding properties.
 - Trees that were to be planted at the end of the gardens were not considered to be appropriate in type/species given that those suggested would grow to 120feet high with a spread of 20metres. They were also not evergreen as stated.
 - It was noted that the application stated that Muss Lane is a two-way road. This was accepted to be incorrect by all present and it was questioned where materials and vehicles would be left during the building works. There would be no space along Muss Lane for any type of parking and further congestion would limit access for emergency vehicles to existing properties.
 - Comments were made on the lack of provision for visitor parking which would also contribute to the congestion and access problems.
 - Councillors agreed with the points raised and considered that 3 properties would have been a better design rather than 4 on the space allocated. All resolved to object to the application on grounds of overdevelopment, character of area, trees, parking and safety and design.
- 6.2 King Somborne PC – Re-consult on amendments – Response 13.11.2019 and 22.06.2021 –
Re-submit previous comments
- 6.3 Romsey and District Society Planning Committee – Comment
- We welcome the reduction in numbers of dwellings on the site and equalization of garden sizes. The rustic representation in the sketch drawing does not seem to provide an accurate portrayal of the

development. The architectural forms of the buildings as shown on plans and elevations would seem to portray a suburban solution in this countryside location.

6.4 The Corner House (land owner) - Comment

- As a child from the 50's, Richard can recall that on both sides of Muss Lane there originally stood old cottages and green land. Over time this has been developed into the five houses along the west side of the lane, namely, Bramleys, Oakleigh, Strawberry Fields, Winterbourne and Hope Cottage. To the east of the lane there is Jaysgarth Brookvale, and Oak Tree House.
- Richard's grandfather originally purchased the ground, part of which is proposed for development, and had a black wooden bungalow built which was later demolished and replaced by 'Marfield'. A few years later, to the north of where Marfield is now, a bungalow called 'St Martins' was built. This was then demolished and replaced with 'Harvest Cottage'. Marfield had a double garage built which had permission for a road access across the top of "the green". This access was never put in place because the shared access was sufficient along the front of Morecroft and Vine Cottage.
- There was an old Nissen hut, which originally stood where Samphia is now situated. This fell into disrepair and eventually was replaced by a three bedroom house as above.
- "The green" has had many uses over the years. It used to be Richard's father's vegetable patch, but when he was unable to maintain it we turned it into grass land for easier maintenance. Since this time we have gladly allowed villagers to use this piece of land for their benefit, i.e. the Queen's jubilee street party, car parking for christenings etc., and for parking and storage of building materials and waste for anyone that has needed it in the lane whilst undertaking construction works. All we have asked for in return is that they leave the land as they found it.
- We have always kept this piece of land very well maintained to the point where we think they forget who it belongs to. This is, at the end of the day, a privately owned piece of land. To access Muss Lane from Winchester Road, originally there was an open ford, which was replaced by an Irish ford and then later replaced by a concrete road bridge. This was to help all service vehicles to access the lane more easily. For example, the refuse lorry, oil tankers and any other delivery vehicles.
- When the village was put on mains drainage this required large lorries to work in the lane. Living at the entrance of Muss Lane we have encountered many instances of disruption over the years. Unquestionably, given the location of our cottage (The Corner House/Corner Stores), when there has been development/deliveries in the lane, all vehicles have had to pass in close proximity to our property. We have never complained about this or sought to stand in anyone's way, as we have always fully understood that change and development is necessary and useful. In fact we have always gone out of our way to be as helpful and accommodating as we possibly can.

6.5 Samphia and Marfield Muss Lane, 9 Ford Ave Chandlers Ford – Support Long standing residents

- I lived in Morecroft for 14 years, and when the application was first submitted I was very pleased about it. These are much needed new houses. There has been no new developments in the area in the time that I have lived in Kings Somborne. It's good to hear that these are eco-friendly homes, in times when we need to be thinking about the environment.
- I moved to Samphia in November 2019, with the full knowledge that the planning application was still pending. Out of all the residents in the lane, the works are likely to cause me the most disruption, however I fully support the build.
- I write in support of the planning application in Muss Lane, which is sited in the settlement area.
- I have lived in Muss Lane all my life and support the build.

Previous material delivery and construction methods

- I write in support of the planning application in Muss Lane. I am the previous owner of Samphia which was a self-build house. We had all our materials, blocks, bricks, roof tiles and aggregates delivered directly into the lane on big wagons, which then turned around in the car park at the top of the lane. We at one point had 4/5 concrete lorries turning up in a day to pour and the same again with grab lorries to take away soil/rubble etc. This, to my knowledge, did not cause the mass disruption which seems to be feared. I understand the developer has made arrangements so materials do not have to be dropped directly into the lane. In addition (with the landowner's permission) we stored all our materials that arrived on the green out the front, together with all soil and rubble that needed to go. Furthermore we had to dig trenches across the green to facilitate water supply/waste/electricity supply and telephone line, again without complaint. It was very easy to restore the green again and obviously looking at it now you would never have known it happened. We had several trades people coming to and from the property/green, and in my experience they do not go out of their way to be troublesome/get in the way, but rather, are respectful and do their best to cause minimal disruption on the road and to neighbours. One example of this is when we had our water supply connected and the lane had to be closed to do so, this was easily dealt with by giving all parties in the lane plenty of notice so they were able to move their vehicles out if needed prior to the contractors arriving, so they didn't suffer the inconvenience of not being able to get out.

Improve area

- In my view, the proposal would bring an overgrown, unkept site back into a positive use which would benefit the area.

Drainage

- I am aware there are concerns from other residents regarding the water pooling at the entrance to Vine Cottage and the footpath. Nobody seems to take ownership of the road. The pooling is down to lack of maintenance, and the continual turning of cars and delivery lorries entering the four homes to the rear of Vine Cottage and Jaysgarth. This is causing the road to break up and dip which leaves the water to collect in the resulting depression. This has only happened since the said four homes have been built.

Other developments in Muss Lane

- I have lived in Muss Lane all of my life. In that time I have witnessed the following: The installation of an Irish ford. Later, the Culvert road bridge at the entrance to Muss Lane. A group of four new homes. Eight new builds. Several extensions. Studios in back gardens. During this time "the privately owned green" has been used for the storage of new building materials and waste removal. In addition, more recently, it was used for new road materials for the four homes behind Vine Cottage, and waste removal that was awaiting collection. "The green" has always been restored to good order. All the above works had large lorries to support people's needs, i.e. furniture, gas, oil, building lorries etc. Of course there will be some disruption, as all of the above have caused, but without that how do we progress and get much needed new homes built?

Muss definition

- As a side note the definition of "Muss" is to make messy or untidy.

6.6 18 x various addresses – Objection (summarised comments)

Character and appearance

- I believe that in the design of the dwellings there is a much better recognition of the local vernacular than with the previous proposal, and I have read the well considered analysis of the proposal by the Council's Conservation Officer. However, I feel that this assessment omits one vitally important consideration; namely the bulk of the development resulting from the size of the dwellings and their close relationship with each other.
- A feature of the Conservation Area, which is not uncommon in other Test Valley rural conservation areas, is that modern detached dwellings where they have occurred have generally generous space around them, more in keeping with the rural feel of the area. This proposal would result in decidedly cramped development, would have a poor built form to open space relationship, and no sense of openness whatsoever, quite alien to the established character of the area.
- It would fail the 'statutory test' in that it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kings Somborne Conservation Area. Added to this is the fact there would be inevitable proposals to extend the dwellings, facilitated by relatively recent increased permitted development tolerances, and so adding to the bulk of building and the harm to the area.

6.7 Overdevelopment

- Whilst I appreciate the number of houses have been reduced and the design improved it is still overdevelopment of the space in this location.
- The housing density is too high to be consistent with neighbouring parts of the Conservation Area.
- The proposed four houses would create a continuous wall of brick across the site

6.8 Heritage assets

- The open grassed area in Muss Lane is so important to Muss Lane itself, but especially to the setting of the listed buildings, Vine and Moorcroft Cottages. The access proposals for the development, as shown on the revised plans, would have disastrous consequences for this area, and this effect could be mitigated by a more modest proposal which carried with it a less invasive access arrangement.
- The new plans show a significant widening of the road from 4.8m to 14.4m meaning "The Green" will be significantly reduced in size. This is completely disproportionate in relation to the width of Muss Lane at the junction (2.7m). It will create a large mass of tarmac that will look an 'eyesore' not in keeping with the unique character of the lane, the Village and conservation area.

6.9 Trees

- The removal of trees and hedgerow appear contrary to King's Somborne Conservation Plan and as such should be saved and enhanced, not destroyed as proposed in this application. For many these trees and shrubs may be all that stand between them and the proposed urban landscape. I note on previous correspondence concern regards tree roots, the safe preservation of trees within the Conservation Area needs to be taken very seriously, due to the vital nature of any natural screening to this urban density.
- The three proposed evergreen trees and deciduous and can grow to a height of 120 feet. These are totally unsuitable for planting at the end of our garden and will create loss of light.
- Our house is directly in front of the proposed development and we are concerned to now see a screen planting of evergreen trees shown around our rear boundary and are worried these may be Cypress Leylandii. We would like clarification of tree species as we would not like anything planted which would grow to a great height with a loss of natural light to our garden. The developer originally mentioned espalier fruit trees being used, these would be more acceptable as they would add diversity and encourage bees and insects.

6.10 Hedgerow

- The Sycamore (T23) and Field Maple (G1) on the southern boundary are significant trees for the privacy of the adjacent front Amenity space of the adjacent house from H2 and visual appearance from Riverside Green to part screen the towering (9.5mt) side elevation of H2. These trees are detailed for removal as part of the tree survey to assist with the

development but should be retained and any property moved far enough away from the boundary to secure the Tree Root protection areas of these trees.

6.11 Impacts on neighbouring properties

- The average distance between the proposed dwelling H1 and the common site boundary with Walnut Cottage would be about 2.7m and the corresponding distance with H2 about 8.2m. In normal circumstances with no appreciable difference in levels, and given the disposition of these two proposed dwellings in relation to Walnut Cottage, there would not be an issue, but with the application site appearing to be at least 3m higher, the proposed dwellings would be excessively dominant and would be harmful to the enjoyment of the garden area of Walnut Cottage, and as regards proposed dwelling H2, to the outlook from windows to principal rooms on the north-eastern elevation.
- The significant height differential of the land to be developed, which is underplayed in the proposal, and the land level of existing surrounding homes is such that the new properties of the current design will tower over existing homes, dominating the skyline in a conservation area. This will overshadow the properties and significantly reduce the already limited light of north facing gardens and properties. This will create an urban backdrop to a village setting, which is not in keeping with our Local Plan and TVBC stated policy.
- Privacy could be reasonably safeguarded by the insertion of obscure glazed windows only on the facing elevations of H1 and H2, but for reasons of dominance and impact there would be unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of Walnut Cottage and the proposal is in conflict with Local Plan policy LHW4.
- Overlooking would occur at Harvest Cottage

6.12 Noise

- None of the drawings show the positions of the machines stated as being the individual heating source. These machines are notorious for producing considerable annoying background noise for neighbouring properties and the individual surrounding households themselves, especially in such a confined development area as being proposed.

6.13 Highway impacts

- Modern cars are too big for the proposed garages
- The proposed access route provides a wider turning arc and the sight line is significantly improved, however it does detract significantly from the rural aspect of the Lane and Green.
- If this new access route is rejected I will undertake whatever means necessary to prevent trespass on my property. Inevitably and regrettably this will result in obstruction and congestion in Muss Lane at the point of access and elsewhere.
- An alternate solution would entail relocating the power pole and widening the junction at that point.
- The contractors should be required to ensure that no vehicles materials etc wishing to access the site cause any obstruction to or the safe access of Muss Lane.

- The previous proposals for construction vehicle parking on the green area remains completely unfair on local residents. One year of disruption will impact adversely upon the well being of residents and the cohesion of community and will not offer any enhancement of the village. Construction vehicle parking must be contained within the site if the community is to be able to cope with development. If the site is unable to accommodate this parking without utilising the green area then there is little hope the ultimate site will cope with the proposed homeowners parking requirements.
- The only concerns appear to be vehicular visibility within the scheme, internal site layout and parking provision. Muss Lane is a narrow road with no footways and has a 'pinch point' at the junction with Vicarage Lane which has resulted in many traffic 'incidents'.
- Surely these factors must be taken into account when assessing the implications of the extra traffic generated by the proposal, taking into account not just the residential vehicles, but the larger delivery, service and refuse vehicles which are becoming more prolific on our residential streets and roads? Consider the repeated conflicts that are bound to occur with these larger vehicles and other vehicles travelling in the opposite direction in Muss Lane? The fact is that Muss Lane is inadequate to cater for movements on this scale.
- Perhaps to reinforce this concern the Council needs to take into account that the Parish Council, through the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, is proposing a site for housing development of at least 10 dwellings at Spencers Farm, with vehicular access on to Muss Lane, north of this application site.
- Even with the revised access proposals do not appear to be adequate to cope with the refuse vehicles now in use, which I believe measure 2.25m x 9m. It seems that they would not be able to turn into the private drive serving the development but at the same time they need to be able to get to within 15m of the domestic bins. And so the whole question of access and highway safety becomes somewhat complex and in my view the Highway Authority should be asked to reconsider their stance on this application, taking into account these and other objections which have been expressed by Muss Lane residents. of the listed buildings. As the proposal stands, I believe that there is fundamental conflict with policies T1 and T2 of the Local Plan.

6.14 Housing mix

- Kings Somborne has an abundance of executive homes which is unaffordable to most young people in the area. 'More of the same' is not required as these are tailored to commuters who have little interaction with the community or amenities.

6.15 Drainage

- An issue that does not appear to have been addressed is ensuring adequate rainwater drainage. The new widened access road which slopes downhill towards "The Green" and "Winterborne" would act as a large run off area and reduce natural drainage. Where will all this water go during heavy rainfall?

6.16 Bin store

- The proposed position of the bin store is immediately adjacent the short garden of Samphia and thus close to living areas of the house and in addition, it is immediately adjacent the garden of 17 Riverside Green. Smells may become a problem from these bins especially if collections are delayed or missed and vermin will be attracted to this concentration of refuse which will include food waste especially when bins become over full. This will become an even greater problem when the allocated area is increased to comply with regulations as mentioned before.
- The refuse generated from a four bedroom household can often exceed the capacity of the wheelie bin and loose bags of refuse not able to fit into the bin will be torn by vermin and other scavenging animals.
- Currently this area is overgrown and provides for good habitat for Rodents and Vermin. These Rodents and other Vermin will be looking to populate the area again once construction is completed and will do so more readily if there is a constant source of food and accommodation in the form of a dry and safe shelter.
- If it were to be a bin store area or store for large bins, who would keep it tidy and hygienic? Who would maintain it?

6.17 Ownership and future development of the Green

- We were previously led to believe by Millgate that post construction "The Green" would become the responsibility of the owners of the new properties being built. How will this be enforced, who would actually maintain the land, and what recourse do we have if the area does become unkempt and an eyesore?
- Finally, we have concerns that ultimately moves will be made to build on "The Green" itself. What guarantees can be put in place to ensure this unique space remains an asset that is enjoyed by the whole community both now and in the future.
- Who is going to manage the green once the work is finished? A solution could be the developer hands over the green to a management committee formed by residents of Muss Lane to act as guardians for the future.

6.18 Condition requirements

- Should planning permission be granted for the above application we would like to see conditions applied that help address the concerns raised above. Such as:
Material storage and car parking limited to the building site and not on "The Green" itself.
Long term protection and maintenance of "The Green".
Consideration given as to how construction traffic levels in Muss Lane can be kept to a minimum.
Potential use of smaller trucks, instead of lorries, to transport materials.

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)(RLP)

COM2 – Settlement boundary

COM15 – Infrastructure

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 standard

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Kings Somborne Village Design Statement

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 • The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the surrounding area
- Impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent Listed Buildings
- Trees
- Impact on neighbouring properties
- Highway safety and parking provision
- Ecology
- Nitrate Neutrality
- Water Management
- Archaeology
- Planning Balance

8.2 **Principle of development**

The site is situated within the Kings Somborne settlement boundary as defined in the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 (RLP). As a result, provided the proposed development complies with the other relevant policies of the RLP, it would be acceptable in principle.

8.3 **Impact on the surrounding area**

The proposed site is an undeveloped parcel of land which sits on the north eastern edge of Kings Somborne to the rear of properties on the eastern side of Muss Lane and north of Riverside Green. The plot is located within the Kings Somborne Conservation Area, there are two Grade II listed thatched cottages to the southwest which face on to Muss Lane (Morecroft and Vine Cottage).

There is a mixed character of development surrounding the site; to the south is the historic core of the village, with a number of traditional/character properties ranging from small thatched cottages to large detached formal houses fronting the stream along Winchester Road and Old Vicarage Lane. To the north of the site is a mid C20th local authority housing estate which comprises

predominantly of semi-detached brick built houses and bungalows on fairly open and spacious plots. Adjacent the site are a small number of large detached late C20th properties which face onto Muss Lane and front a small grassed green. At the site entrance the driveway will access the site between a single storey bungalow 'Marfield' to the north and 'Samphia' a chalet bungalow to the south.

- 8.4 Due to the proposed development of four dwellings being located to the rear of the properties which front Muss Lane and the green it is not considered that the development would be clearly visible from the public realm upon approaching from either direction on Muss lane. The change in level up to the site would result in the roof tops being seen but a view of rooftops in this part of Kings Somborne is not uncommon. Once directly in front of the access the view of the development would be of a single track access past properties at Marfield and Samphia towards the rear of the site. Plot 2 would likely be most visible from this view. This proposes a single storey garage directly opposite. Partial views are also likely to be given of plot 1 which would be of a two storey red multi brick built property with side profiles of a hipped roof and dormer windows with an oak framed porch. These dwellings would screen some views through to the open paddock beyond but given the spacing of the dwellings through the site together with the single and two storey elements of the design which would continue to offer views through the site it is considered that the development can integrate successfully into this part of the village within the settlement boundary without significant harm to existing public views. The access would be routed east to west to avoid passing directly by the nearby the listed cottages. Routes leading to further properties from Muss Lane and other surrounding areas such as Riverside Green is not uncommon in the locality. The large majority of the green would be preserved and the setting of the Conservation area and this particular part of Kings Somborne would not be significantly harmed by the introduction of an access in this location.
- 8.5 Whilst the introduction of dwellings to the rear of these properties on this side of Muss Lane would create development where no strong development pattern currently exists it is considered that the development provides a comprehensive use of this land for housing which is not out of character with the wider area. Development in the area resulting in a diverse array of residential properties includes Walnut Cottage (17 Riverside Green) to the South accessed from Riverside Gardens permitted in 2017, Strawberry Fields fronting Muss Lane permitted in 2006 and Sampha permitted in 2008 adjacent the 2 grade 2 listed cottages fronting the green.
- 8.6 Public Right Of Way FP14 is located to the south of the site, south of Walnut Cottage and is located on a west/east axis. Views of the site are given on an angle from the footpath particularly from the part of the route which is adjacent properties at Riverside Green with a separation distance at the closest point of approx. 14m. These views are screening by existing trees and shrubs at present. With the development of the site these views would alter to that of rear residential gardens as a result of the development but various views of amenity space at residential properties is an overriding theme of the route of the footpath and as such this is not considered to be out of character within the landscape.

- 8.7 The previous application detailed above in paragraph 4.1 was withdrawn in part due to concerns in relation to the layout, height, scale and design of the dwellings creating a cramped form of development. In response to this the current application has reduced the properties size and changed the shape and siting of the dwellings to reduce the overall massing of the dwellings.
- 8.8 Although policies E1 and E2 which consider high quality development and the landscape character of the Borough do not consider specific plot sizes an assessment of surrounding plot sizes in the immediate locality has been undertaken as follows to understand the average plot sizes.

Property	Approximate Plot Size (Hectares)
<u>Application site (Currently under consideration)</u>	
Plot 1	0.056
Plot 2	0.057
Plot 3	0.044
Plot 4	0.055
AVERAGE	0.053
<u>Houses adjacent development site</u>	
Marfield	0.048
Harvest Cottage	0.084
Sampha	0.028
Morecroft	0.085
Vine Cottage	0.050
Walnut Cottage	0.10
AVERAGE	0.079

- 8.9 Given the proposal is to sub divide an existing plot of land the plot sizes are on average smaller than those in the immediate vicinity. However the resultant plot sizes are not significantly smaller than some examples in the area ensuring the development complements the existing character. The impact the proposed plots would have on the area needs to be assessed alongside other design factors to understand whether the development as a whole would result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 8.10 It is considered that the reduction in scale and re-siting of the dwellings has resulted in a layout that provides a greater sense of space around the dwellings. At the closest point of plot 3 which would be located closest the public realm offset from the access road, the development would be located approx. 93m from the public realm on Muss Lane. Whilst the dwellings would be located at a higher level than the neighbouring properties in the Muss Lane vicinity the dwellings would take the appearance similar to that seen at the properties located on the northern end of Muss Lane which are also on higher land than the southern area of the Lane. The combination of the change in levels already seen in built form elsewhere on the Lane, and the distances

away from the public realm, together with the overall reduction in roof massing and width of the plots creating a less dominant built form and a reduction of prominent views from Muss Lane and the public right of way results in a development which can be provided in this location without significant harm on the character of the surrounding area. Subject to appropriate conditions ensuring materials and landscaping information is secured together with levels information it is considered that this proposal would create high quality development in the Borough in accordance with policy E1 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016

8.11 Impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent Listed Buildings

The plot is located within the Kings Somborne Conservation Area. There are two Grade II listed thatched cottages 40m to the southwest which face on to Muss Lane (Morecroft and Vine Cottage), these cottages currently share the access with the site, however the proposals look to create a new separate access to the north of the listed properties. There is a mixed character of development surrounding the site; to the south is the historic core of the village, with a number of traditional/character properties ranging from small thatched cottages to large detached formal houses fronting the stream along Winchester Road and Old Vicarage Lane. To the north of the site is a mid C20th local authority housing estate which comprises predominantly of semi-detached brick built houses and bungalows on fairly open and spacious plots. Adjacent the site are a small number of large detached late C20th properties which face onto Muss Lane. At the site entrance the driveway will access the site between a single storey bungalow 'Marfield' to the north and 'Samphia' a chalet bungalow to the south.

8.12 The Conservation Officer has commented that given the level of modern development in this part of the village already, it is considered the principle of developing the plot is acceptable, as an appropriately designed development would be viewed in the context of the existing modern dwellings on Muss Lane, and therefore should not add to the impact on the character of the historic village (Conservation Area) and the setting of the Listed Buildings. The site should also be viewed in the context of Riverside Green to the southwest. This is a modern cul-de-sac of properties of mixed sizes, including some terraces. As with Muss Lane, the properties are generally afforded quite large gardens in proportion to their buildings' sizes.

8.13 Reducing the number of houses has allowed the proposals to be better in proportion to their plot sizes, which, in turn, results in the development intergrating into the surrounding Conservation Area successfully. It allows views through of the trees and creates a sense of openness, maintaining the edge-of-village character. In terms of the layout the reduction in size has significantly reduced the density of the development, and has also allowed the buildings to be positioned on the site in a looser and less formal manner. The result is that, though the development would still be a cul-de-sac, this edge of settlement development would not appear to suburban.

- 8.14 The entrance point now no longer has any significant impact on the green area to the front of the listed buildings cited above. The designs of the buildings creates four distinct properties, which have sufficient similarities in their palette of materials, form, and detailing to create a cohesive development, but which also has sufficient differences that they don't look alien in this village setting. The detailing – such as some of the properties having half-hips, breakthrough dormers, and tile-hanging means they reflect the character of village dwellings in this part of Test Valley.
- 8.15 Overall it is considered subject to an appropriate condition for details in respect of materials, that the development can be provided without significant harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings. The development is considered to comply with policy E9 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.
- 8.16 **Trees**
The revised layout provides a better relationship with trees to be retained addressing previous concern from the Tree Officer. The proposed replanting is acceptable and achievable subject to the protection of sufficient soil volume for their long term healthy growth which is set out in Tree Protection Plan. The submission is accompanied by a revised arboricultural report which includes an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan which are both appropriate and fit for purpose. Subject to appropriate conditions and notes the Tree Officer has no objection and it is considered that the development can be provided in accordance with policy E2 of the Revised Borough Local Plan.
- 8.17 **Impact on neighbouring properties**
Walnut Cottage (17 Riverside Green)
This neighbour would be located to the south of the application site, the boundary is currently made up of a close board fence and retaining wall together with some shrubs and trees. Plot 1 and 2 are located adjacent this boundary. Given the proposed dwellings would be located to the north of this neighbour the application is not considered to create any overshadowing towards this neighbouring property.
- 8.18 The dwelling at plot 1 would be sited approx. level with the dwelling at Walnut Cottage. There is approximately 6.8m between the side elevation of plot 1 and Walnut Cottage. Walnut Cottage is also on lower ground level. When viewed from the application site the first floor windows and flat/lantern roof of a single storey projection at Walnut Cottage are visible over the boundary fence which is approx. 2m in height located on top of raised planters on the Walnut Cottage side. Facing this neighbour directly from plot 1 would be a hipped roof with solar panels, a first floor obscurely glazed window and 4 windows (2 of which are recessed slightly further back) and 1 doorway at ground floor. Windows are also proposed on the western and eastern elevations facing into the application site. The ground floor windows would be screened from this neighbour by the existing close board fence on the boundary. The first floor window would be clearly visible over the boundary treatment and would provide direct views towards this neighbouring properties two storey side wall and oblique views towards the driveway and rear garden. Given this window

serves a bathroom it is considered appropriate to apply a condition ensuring this window is obscurely glazed and top hung opening only. A further condition is also recommended to remove permitted development for any further windows at first floor or in the roof space to be permitted in the elevation facing this neighbouring property. Oblique views would also be given from first floor windows on the eastern and western elevation of plot 1 but given these views would be indirect it is not considered that a reason for refusal could be substantiated on these grounds.

- 8.19 The southern elevation of plot 2 directly faces the driveway and detached garage at this neighbouring property. There is a separation distance of approximately 7.8m from the southern elevation of plot 2 and the boundary with this neighbour. 2 first floor obscured windows are proposed here together with 4 windows at ground floor. Again it is considered that the ground floor windows would be screened from this neighbour by the existing boundary fence. At first floor these windows would directly face the driveway at this neighbouring property however these openings are recommended to be obscurely glazed and top hung opening only via condition and a further condition is also recommended to remove permitted development for any further windows at first floor or in the roof space to be permitted in the elevation facing this neighbouring property. Despite the change in levels between the two neighbours given the distance this plot is set back from the neighbour, taking into account the area it faces a driveway/garage and the conditions recommended it is not considered that these openings would create a significant level of overlooking towards this neighbouring property.
- 8.20 In respect of loss of light and overbearing impacts the separation distances mentioned above and taking into account the property at plot 1 would be positioned to the north adjacent the existing property at Walnut Cottage it is not considered that any overbearing or loss of light impacts would be created within the rear private garden area. Where plot 1 is located adjacent existing windows at Walnut Cottage plans submitted with the revised scheme for the building of Walnut Cottage under application no 17/03021/FULLS show that both windows facing the application site serve bathrooms. Given these rooms are secondary rooms it is not considered that any loss of light or overbearing impact created here would be significant enough to result in a reason for refusal on this basis. Limited weight is given to the side access path sited adjacent the boundary at Walnut Cottage as it is not considered that occupants would spend a large amount of amenity time within this area. Subject to the conditions set out above together with a levels condition it is considered the development can be provided without significant harm to this neighbouring properties amenity in accordance with policy LHW4 of RLP.
- 8.21 Harvest Cottage and Marfield
These neighbours are located to the west of the application site with plots 3 and 4 to the east of the rear gardens. The dwellings at the closest point will be approx 14m away from the boundaries with these neighbours. Given these distances it is not considered that an unacceptable level of overlooking, overshadowing or loss of light would occur as a result of the development at these neighbouring properties. There is a single storey car garage proposed

adjacent the boundary but given the single storey nature of this structure it is not considered that it would have any significant impact on the amenity at these residential properties. The access into the development site would pass Marfield but it is not considered that the movements of 4 dwellings would create a significant impact on this properties amenity with an appropriate surface laid which can be secured through the hard landscaping information. It is considered the development can be provided without significant harm to this neighbouring properties amenity in accordance with policy LHW4 of RLP.

8.22 Morecroft and Samphia

These properties are located to the west of the development site adjacent plot 1. The elevation facing these neighbours would be approximately 10m to the boundary with Morecroft at the closest point and 27m to the boundary with Sampha. Whilst plot 1 would be located on higher ground than these neighbouring properties it is considered that taking into account the distances set out and intervening boundary treatments the development would not result in significant impacts to the amenity of these neighbouring properties. Similarly with Samphia the access into the development site would pass the side elevation of this property but with an appropriate surface laid which can be secured through the hard landscaping information it is considered the development can be provided without significant harm to this neighbouring properties amenity in accordance with policy LHW4 of RLP.

8.23 Future occupiers

Due to the siting of plot 2 adjacent the rear garden of plot 3 and clearly visible from the rear garden of plot 4 it is considered appropriate to apply conditions ensuring that the window on plot 2 at first floor facing these plots is obscurely glazed and to remove permitted development for the placement of any further windows in the future. Plot 2 is sited to the south of plot 3 so some shadow would be cast towards plot 3. However, a separation distance has been created with the siting of a single storey garage on the boundary to mitigate any shading effects of the two storey element of the dwelling thereby reducing impacts from overshadowing. Subject to conditions it is considered the development can be provided without significant harm to future occupier's amenity in accordance with policy LHW4 of RLP.

8.24 Bin storage

The bin storage has been sited adjacent the visitor parking area to the rear of Marfield and next to the access road. The Refuse Officer has confirmed that this location is appropriate for collection. The bin store location has been agreed with the Environmental Health Officer given its location separated from any immediate existing or proposed dwelling and outside amenity space. It is not considered that the position of the storage in this location would create any impacts on neighbouring properties in respect of smell in accordance with policy E8 which concerns pollution.

8.25 Noise

Concern has been raised by neighbours in respect of the noise impacts from proposed Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) at each proposed plot. The Environmental Health Officer has sought further clarification on ASHP locations and the requirement for the BS4142 assessment. An update will follow.

8.26 **Highways**
Parking

The proposed dwellings would be provided with off-street parking in accordance with the parking standards set out in the RLP. As the proposal is for less than 5 dwellings the parking annexe does not require visitor parking provision however two spaces are provided. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy T2.

8.27 Impact on the highway network

Earlier consultation responses upon this proposal, cumulated in no specific objections being raised by the Highway Authority subject to TVBC Waste and Environmental services being satisfied in regard to how refuse collection was proposed from the site. From the outset, the proposed scheme has evolved in this regard with a widened access being proposed in order to allow for access/egress for a refuse vehicle. The evolving scheme reduced the access width off of Muss Lane with refuse collection being proposed directly from Muss Lane mirroring the existing situation.

8.28 Currently, it is understood that the TVBC refuse vehicle reverses along Muss Lane for collection. In this regard, the previous consultation response from the Highway Authority concluded that the amended application to allow for a refuse store raised no objections subject to TVBC Waste and Environmental services being content in this regard.

8.29 TVBC Waste and Environmental Services have again confirmed to the Highway Authority that the creation of the bin storage area allows the collection crews easy access to the bins and results in no requirement to gain access to the private access road for the refuse vehicle. In line with the above, the Highway Authority would confirm no objections to the proposal.

8.30 Construction management

A number of comments have raised concern about construction access and traffic. The applicant had previously submitted initial information about how the construction of the dwelling may operate and HCC Highways have provided comment on this. The applicant has since withdrawn this information and a condition has been applied to the recommendation for a full construction management plan to be agreed with the local authority prior to work starting. The applicant has confirmed that they are content to address and put in place measures to satisfy any local concerns.

8.31 Subject to appropriate conditions it is considered that the development can be provided in accordance with policy T1 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

8.32 **Ecology**

The current application is supported by an updated Ecological Assessment (CC Ecology, July 2019).

Designated sites

There are no statutory or non-statutory sites on, adjacent to or near the application site. The nearest such site is Kings Somborne Cemetery Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), approximately 200m to the north. This is designated primarily for its impoverished grassland which retains sufficient elements of relic unimproved grassland to enable recovery. Given the scale of the proposed development and nature of the designated site, it is unlikely that this would be adversely affected by the proposal.

8.33 Habitats

The majority of the site comprises rank, coarse grassland interspersed with ruderals. Areas of grassland have been mown within the west of the main compartment and at the site access. Further habitats are present around the boundaries and within the centre of the main compartment, notably areas of scrub and conifer trees. Mature and more ecologically-rich hedgerows which include some mature trees are present along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of the site. Aside from the hedgerows, the County Ecologist states that these habitats are not particularly notable in terms of their intrinsic biodiversity interest. However, such habitats can support other protected species, such as reptiles, dormice and bats. In terms of the more ecologically valuable hedgerows and trees, these are being retained in the development, and have scope for enhancement.

8.34 Bats – roosting

The survey has revealed that a number of trees within the site boundaries support low suitability for roosting bats. This is as a result of dense ivy cladding. Whilst further survey is not necessary for low suitability trees, the Bat Conservation Trust's good practice survey guidelines do recommend that all low suitability trees are soft felled. Appropriate recommendations for the felling of low suitability trees has been included within their report.

8.35 Bats – foraging

The site is considered to support limited opportunities for foraging and commuting bats. The features of most importance to bats at the site are being retained and the proposal includes the delivery of habitat features which will be of value for foraging and commuting bats. Recommendations have also been made for a lighting strategy which ensures the retained and proposed features are not illuminated. The County Ecologist would raise no concerns over this.

8.36 Dormice

Dense scrub vegetation such as this can support dormice, which are legally protected under UK and EU law. However, aerial photos suggest that the dense vegetation on site is relatively recent growth, and in the absence of strong ecological connectivity to other areas of potential dormouse habitat nearby, the County Ecologist would consider that it is unlikely that dormice are present at the site.

8.37 Reptiles

The County Ecologist requested further information on this subject which has since been received. The applicants Ecologist has confirmed that reptile surveys have not been carried out at Muss Lane. In considering the habitat at the time to be relatively sub-optimal for reptiles and with the lack of records in the area and our consideration of the surrounding habitats and general sparse arable landscape, it's unlikely that the site will support anything more than a very low population of slow worms, if anything. The reptile mitigation strategy has since been submitted and clarified the assessment of the site. Subject to compliance with the information provided the County Ecologist has no concerns over the proposals in this respect.

8.38 Subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the recommendations in the ecological information submitted it is considered the development can be provided in accordance with policy E5 which concerns biodiversity.

8.39 **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.

8.40 As such, the advice from Natural England (June 2019 version 2 and March 2020 version 3) 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.

8.41 The applicant has submitted calculations to demonstrate that by taking 0.49 ha of land out of agricultural production in perpetuity they can achieve nutrient neutrality. They have confirmed that they would enter into a legal agreement to secure the 0.49 ha of land to be taken out of production in perpetuity. This land is provided within the Borough at Fullerton Farm. 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. An update on completion of the legal agreement will be provided at present the recommendation is made pending its completion.

8.42 **Water Management**

Consumption

The Revised Local Plan includes a requirement under policy E7 for all new residential dwellings to achieve a water consumption standard of no more than 100 litres per person per day. This reflects the requirements of part G2 of the 2015 Building Regulations. It is recommended that a condition be added in order to address this. Subject to this condition the proposal would comply with policy E7 of the Revised Local Plan 2016.

8.43 Flood risk

The application site area falls within Flood Zone 1. The site is at low risk of flooding from all sources.

8.44 Drainage – surface water

It is proposed to discharge surface water runoff from the site's impermeable surfaces into the ground. Each individual self build unit will drain to an individual soakaway. Comments have been received in respect of existing impacts of water after heavy rains on Muss Lane. It is not considered that as a result of this development additional impacts would be created given the proposals to manage the water on site appropriately. Conditions are included within the recommendation in respect drainage and the proposed hard surfaces such as the access and ensuring adequate run off provision is provided without discharge onto the public highway.

8.45 Drainage - Foul

It is proposed to connect the dwellings to the existing mains sewer network.

8.46 **Archaeology**

There are no archaeological sites currently recorded at this location, nor in the immediate vicinity. The site also lies outside the historic core of the medieval settlement. Accordingly the proposal is unlikely to adversely affect archaeological remains at the site and the recommendation does not include any condition in respect of archaeology.

8.47 **Planning Balance**

Whilst in the main concerns have been raised by third parties that the proposal represents overdevelopment with an unsatisfactory site access and construction traffic management proposals these matters are not afforded significant weight in the planning balance given the proposal is considered acceptable in both technical and professional judgement terms. Significant weight in the planning balance is however afforded to the site being located within the settlement boundary of Kings Somborne and that the proposal complies with the Local Plan. The development is designed, sited and is of a scale that is appropriate to the setting and character and nearby Listed buildings, and on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and moderate weight is attached to this. The proposal also delivers housing and with that comes broad economic benefits from housing developments in accordance with the Local Plan. Furthermore moderate weight is also afforded to achieving highway safety, water management and ecological considerations. The NPPF requires the determination of an application in

accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Given the proposal complies with the Local Plan this is afforded significant weight. With other factors also contributing to the planning balance the proposal is recommended because balance in favour of doing so is considered to outweigh any harm created by the development.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable and complies with relevant policies within the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

PERMISSION subject to:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

01

875/02

875/07

875/10

875/09

875/11

875/14

875/13

875/12

875/16

875/15

875/18

875/08

875/06

875/17

875/19

875/04

875/05

875/20

875

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

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 has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.

- 4. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details, including plans and cross sections, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course in relation thereto. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure satisfactory relationship between the new development and the adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1

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

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

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

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

- 6. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until a schedule of landscape management and maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas and an implementation programme, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme.**

Reason: To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by proper maintenance of existing and new landscape features as an

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

7. No development shall take place above DPC until full details of all new windows and doors shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work. The windows and doors shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E9.

8. No development shall take place above DPC until full details of all new vents, flues, aerials, meter boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work. The vents, flues, aerials and meter boxes shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E9.

9. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out within the Technical Arboriculture Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement reference AIA/AMS-C/MH/MUS/001revisionA of July 2019. 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.

10. Tree protective measures installed (in accordance with the tree protection condition) shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or until such time as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities, nor material storage, nor placement of site huts or other equipment what-so-ever shall take place within the barrier.

Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.

11. All service routes, drain runs, soakaways or excavations in connection with the development hereby permitted shall remain wholly outside the tree protective barrier.

Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows in the southern elevation of plot 1 or the southern and northern elevations of plot 2 of the proposal hereby permitted [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can exercise control in the locality in the interest of the local amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy

- 13. The first floor windows in the southern elevation of plot 1 and the southern and northern elevations of plot 2 of the development hereby permitted shall be fitted with obscured glazing and shall be top hung opening only, and thereafter 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 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy LWH4.

- 14. The development shall not be brought into use until all areas indicated to be used for vehicles and pedestrians on the approved plan have been laid out with a hardened, sealed and drained surface. Provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the development. Such areas shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development.**

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

- 15. The development shall not commence until details have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval to ensure no surface water from the site discharges onto the adjacent highway. The development shall be carried out in accordance with approved detail and shall not be brought into use until the approved scheme has been completed.**

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

- 16. No development shall take place, (including any works of demolition), until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. The approved statement shall include scaled drawings illustrating the provision for –**

- 1) The parking of site operatives and visitors' vehicles.**
- 2) Loading and unloading of plant and materials.**
- 3) Management of construction traffic and access routes.**
- 4) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development.**
- 5) Full swept path vehicle tracking in line with 1-4 above.**
- 6) Wheel cleaning and chassis of HGVs and delivery vehicles leaving the site**
- 7) Means of keeping the site access road and adjacent public highway clear of mud and debris during site demolition, excavation, preparation and construction.**

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

17. 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 plan and this space shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.
18. Details of any external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to first installing any such lighting before the buildings) are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E5 and LHW4.
19. The development shall be carried out in accordance with CC Ecology Ecological Assessment Rev A dated October 2019.
Reason: To ensure the protection and avoidance of impacts on protected species in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley local plan (2016).

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.
 3. The various trees standing within and adjacent to this site are protected by virtue of standing within the Kings Somborne Conservation Area. Damage to the trees is an offence under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Failure to comply with the tree protection conditions above is likely to result in damage to the trees. Tree damage may lead to the prosecution of those undertaking the work and those causing or permitting the work.
 4. Attention is drawn to the legal agreement dated xxxx
-