

---

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>APPLICATION NO.</b>  | 20/01448/FULLS   |
| <b>APPLICATION TYPE</b> | FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH   |
| <b>REGISTERED</b>       | 03.07.2020   |
| <b>APPLICANT</b>        | Mr Fred Tucker   |
| <b>SITE</b>             | Land West of All Saints Church, Church Lane,<br>Awbridge, SO51 0HN <b>AWBRIDGE</b>   |
| <b>PROPOSAL</b>         | Proposal of three houses with detached garages and<br>package treatment plant; provide a car park and<br>graveyard extension for All Saints Church |
| <b>AMENDMENTS</b>       | Amended Plans/Details received 06.04.21, 26.02.21,<br>20.11.20, 12.11.20, 02.11.20 & 12.08.20.   |
| <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 SAPC at the request of a local ward member as it raises issues of more than local public interest.

## 2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application is situated to the southern side of Church Lane and within the countryside area of Awbridge Parish. The broadly rectangular application site is immediately to the west of the All Saints Church and is currently in use as a horticultural nursery.

## 3.0 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application proposes the erection of three houses with detached garages and package treatment plant; provide a car park and graveyard extension for All Saints Church.

## 4.0 HISTORY

- 4.1 None

## 5.0 CONSULTATIONS

### 5.1 Planning Policy & Transport (Policy) – No objection;

- Policy COM9: Community Led Development – the previous Policy response stated:
- *In the absence of appropriate evidence which can demonstrate support for these amended proposals in the wider community, in order to comply with policy COM9 c) residents should be given the opportunity to view the new proposals and submit comments either expressing support or opposition.*

- Since then the applicant has placed material in the Parish newsletter showing the updated plans and explaining the proposed changes; at the end of the article the planning reference is provided and readers are reminded that they may still make comments for or against the proposals. The newsletter was delivered to all households in Awbridge Parish and it is confirmed that no new comments on the proposal have been received since the newsletter was circulated.
- COM9 c) states “it is demonstrated that the community supports the proposal”. The silence/lack of response to the latest consultation leads to a conclusion of a neutral view – neither expressing support nor opposition. Whilst this does not actively demonstrate positive support for the proposal the applicant is correct in that people have been given opportunity to comment (through a format which every household would have been able to receive); and the applicant has followed through on the previous Policy response; on this basis there is no objection.
- The Case Officer should note that for COM9 c) the views of the community should be seen against the proposal as a whole.

#### 5.2 **Planning & Building (Conservation)** – Comment;

- The relocation of the carpark to the rear, and the siting of the graveyard extension at the front of the site are considered significant improvements. Graveyards are a typical feature in the setting of historic churches, and therefore it will conserve and enhance the setting of the church. The open, green, nature of the graveyard should also allow a better appreciation of the church from the corner than the carpark would have done, and create a buffer between the church and the new dwellings.
- There is no objection to the removal of the community garden.
- The rendering of ‘house 3’ would not be supported. The general style of the proposed dwelling is ‘Arts & Crafts’. Houses of this design would generally be exposed brickwork (in this instance), and not rendered, and it therefore looks incongruous.
- The three proposed dwellings each have an individual design (all working generally from the ‘Arts and Crafts’ genre) which prevents the development looking too uniform. To create further diversity, a subtly different palette of materials could be used for each house instead of rendering one – e.g. slightly different tones of bricks and tiles. A condition for submission of materials and finishes is recommended.

#### 5.3 **Planning & Building (Landscape)** – No objection,;

- The amendments include the removal of the community garden, relocation of the proposed car park and graveyard extension and alterations to the design of the dwellings.
- From a landscape perspective it is considered that the reduced scale and revised layout of the car park and graveyard extension is a significant improvement. The removal of the community garden also provides the properties with more appropriately sized gardens, more in character with that of the neighbouring properties.

- 5.4 **Planning & Building (Ecology)** – No objection;
- Following previous concerns in relation to tree works, great crested newts and the location of proposed mitigation measures, an updated Ecological Assessment (Ecosupport, March 2021).
  - Section 4.2.3 of the Ecological Assessment, it is outlined that no additional trees are proposed to be removed, therefore I would raise no further concern over the requirement for an update to the ecological assessment in this regard.
- 5.5 **HCC Highways** – No objection, subject to condition.
- 5.6 **HCC LLFA** – No objection, subject to condition.
- 5.7 **Natural England** – No objection, subject to s106 to secure nitrate mitigation.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 23.04.2021

6.1 **Awbridge Parish Council** (30.03.21)

The Parish Council wished to clarify a number of comments made in a representation by Mr Coggon.

- In reference to the exhibition at the Church in 2019, he states that the visitors survey undertaken was garnered to show support for the scheme, nor did it allow parishioners to have input on the design of the proposal. He has no evidence of this and he has not raised this issue previously. My personal recollection is the survey requested comments on the scheme.
- In the comments regarding the January 2020 meeting of the PC, no mention is made of the changes made to the plans as a result of parishioner's suggestions.
- Mr Coggon references a proposal by Mr and Mrs Jones regarding the site of the proposed development, however he fails to mention that at the February PC meeting, and to clarify the position of the applicants, Mr Paul Airey (agent for the developer) when questioned by the council clearly stated that an offer to purchase the site would not now be considered.
- Several statements are made regarding the community survey undertaken by the church in 2020, and the council's involvement in this. Mr Coggon fails to mention that councillors were contacted by myself as chairman before saying it would be best for the survey not to be issued by the council. Also that the council would take an 'overseeing' role in ensuring that the results were a true reflection of the views of the community.
- Mr Coggon in his statement regarding the PC meeting in September 2020 claims it was only at this point that the council began to look at ways to make the application acceptable to local residents. This is disingenuous as the council has from the initial representation by the church had many discussions on the plans and sought views from the community.

- In Mr Coggon's conclusion no.4 makes several comments regarding the submission of the application. These are untrue and are again his interpretation, not substantiated by other councillors or members of the community.
- In the conclusion point 8, his comments are without merit, as opposition to a project on the grounds of developers profit are not a reason to oppose it. Plus his views on the extent to which it benefits the village are contradicted by the evidence of support shown by the survey and the democratic decision of the council.
- In conclusion, it has been clearly shown that the Parish Council has been involved with the project from initial conception to the application as it now stands. At all times we have been open to views both for and against the proposal, encouraging dialogue between the community, residents and applicants, where significant changes to the plans have been made in response to issues identified.
- The council has voted in support of this much needed community project on two occasions.

#### 6.2 **Awbridge Parish Council (23.03.21) – Support;**

- Awbridge Parish Council involvement in Church Lane development executive summary/key dates.
- 2005 – PC first alerted to need to enlarge graveyard at All Saints Church.
- 2013 – PC first shows support for enabling development solution.
- 2016 – PC confirms support for enabling solution.
- 2019;
- January – PC supports nursery site enabling development in principle.
- February – PC informed pre-application advice being sought.
- March – Planning proposal first discussed at Annual Parish Assembly.
- August – PC confirms support for Church led application and exhibition detailing scheme.
- September – Public exhibition held at All Saints Church.
- October – December – Further discussion about proposed scheme held at PC meetings.
- See appendices 1-3 for further information.

6.3 For members information the appendices referred to in the PC comments have been reproduced in full at **Appendix A** of this report.

#### 6.4 **Representations received following notification in PC newsletter August 2021**

- None

#### 6.5 **Representations received following amended plans (26.02.21)**

#### 6.6 **12 Representations of Support;**

#### 6.7 Use of the current nursery site

- Refute the suggestions made in representations that the site is not in horticultural use.
- The Nurseries (Fromefield Nurseries Ltd) incorporated in 2000 has been trading from the site since 1987.
- The 'Primary Nursery Site' as described, was sold in 2014 because the business changed to predominantly 'Retail Distance Selling' rather than 'Wholesale' and therefore no longer required such a large plot.
- No attempt to mislead the LPA by stationing of vehicles on site.

#### 6.8 Community Benefit & Need

- Parking and graveyard spaces remains sorely needed.
- Suggestions of alternative parking at the village hall are not practical.
- Extension of the church yard boundary will future-proof the burial the next 20 - 30 years.
- The need for parking is likely to become even more of an issue when the proposed refurbishment of the church takes place. The refurbishment should enable many more communal activities to take place.
- The church is a pivotal player in supporting the local community in worship but also very much in helping young families and older members of the community with regular activities.
- This is a once in a lifetime opportunity for the community.

#### 6.9 Highways safety

- The car park will improve access to Church Lane for emergency vehicles.

#### 6.10 Role of the Parish Council & Community Involvement

- The PPC/developer has held a number of events informing and listening to suggestions from the community, and I am pleased the Parish Council has seen fit to support this application.
- The development proposal has been adjusted numerous times in terms of the number of proposed dwellings, their position and orientation in order to accommodate the views of those who live nearby.

#### 6.11 Character & Appearance

- Amendments allow for re-positioning of the car park to the rear. The landscaping has been added to, with more trees and natural areas behind the housing.

#### 6.12 **23 Representations of Objection;**

#### 6.13 Use of the current nursery site

- Recent erection of signage intended to give the impression of a working nursery and brownfield site.
- Historic paddock use of the land.
- Primary nursery business sold off in 2017
- Intention to mislead the planning authority that the site is previously developed.

#### 6.14 Viability

- Surveyor's report by BNP commissioned by residents of Church Lane concludes that;
- The Applicant's proposals exceed the minimum amount of development required to enable the provision of a new Church car park and graveyard extension.
- The proposals are excessive in scale relative to the community benefits to be provided and a much more modest scheme with a smaller footprint and land take could deliver the same benefits.
- The Applicant's proposals appear to be driven more by their objective of securing a larger profit rather than delivering housing that enables the provision of community facilities.
- The scheme has been prepared and led by the developer rather than by the community. As such does not comply with COM9.
- Largely agree that a development should proceed in order to fund the provision of a small car park and a graveyard extension for the Church but the size of the development is excessive.
- The Diocese should help to fund the Churches requirement - keeping the Church away from Land Development & the ill will and negativity this brings towards a dwindling congregation.

#### 6.15 Role of the Parish Council & Community Involvement

- Lack of genuine community involvement.
- PC blocked discussion of alternative proposal.
- Bias in favour of the scheme
- Limited PC involvement in questionnaire
- Community involvement included persons outside of Awbridge and targeted at members of the church.
- Inadequate community involvement prior to the application
- No suitable engagement with those residents most effected.
- Meetings between Church representatives and Church Lane residents were on a 'Without Prejudice' basis and should not be cited as evidence of engagement or approval of the proposals.

#### 6.16 Community Benefit & Need

- A small group of villagers gain some minor benefits at a considerable cost to many others, notably the inhabitants of Church Lane
- The proposals provide minimal benefit for maximum profit.
- There is no proven need for additional car parking and alternative transport methods should be explored.
- No need for additional burial space.
- Car park size should not have been reduced
- Community garden should not have been removed.
- Approval of this application by TVBC will deprive us of the chance to work together for true community benefit.
- A mixture of smaller more affordable dwellings is required.

6.17 Character and Appearance

- Excessive scale would dominate the lane.
- Overdevelopment
- Changes to the scheme are minor.

6.18 Amenity

- Overlooking to neighbouring properties

6.19 Highways safety

- Increased traffic movements on Church Lane
- Impact on highways safety of Church Lane and Coombe Lane which are limited width.

6.20 **Representations received in response to original submission**

6.21 **67 representations of Support;**

6.22 Community Benefit & Need

- Brilliant idea, though ideally, a larger number of smaller houses would suit better the demographic profile.
- If this doesn't go ahead TVBC should provide a Traveller site there.
- Proposals will benefit the village.
- New burial ground and car park are much needed.
- The church is a social hub for the community.
- Provision of three houses is a small price to pay for the benefits.
- Additional housing is needed.
- Will support the school events.

6.23 Highways safety

- The car park will improve access to Church Lane for emergency vehicles.
- Proposals will improve safety for walkers.
- Current parking provision restricts disabled access.
- Large events have previously relied on the generosity of adjacent land owners for parking.
- Visitors have suffered injury due to lack of parking.

6.24 Role of the Parish Council & Community Involvement

- Believe the PCC has consulted with the village through meetings, events and publications and has garnered the support of the parish council.
- This has been well discussed, and explained over many months at Parish Council Meetings, also a special meeting in the Church, which was well publicised, and also at a Parish Council Meeting.

6.25 Character & Appearance

- The proposals are sympathetic to Church Lane and the surroundings.
- Existing polytunnels are an eyesore.
- Reduction in number of houses to three has reduced impact.

6.26 **47 representations of Objection**

6.27 Community Benefit & Need

- The Village needs more smaller houses.
- Need for the graveyard extension has not been demonstrated.
- Need for the car park has not been demonstrated.
- Proposed car park is excessive in size.
- Community needs are met by the village hall.
- Parking provision can be accommodated at the village hall.
- Community garden is not needed.
- Land was previously gifted to the church but sold on.
- Will the church own the proposed car park & graveyard.

6.28 Highways safety

- Adverse impact on highways safety on narrow roads.
- On street parking is not a significant problem outside specific events.
- Increased traffic has led to the loss of pets.

6.29 Role of the Parish Council & Community Involvement

- Community and Parish Council engagement has excluded and/or minimised view of residents of Church Lane and Coomb Lane.
- A revised scheme should be proposed.
- Question the validity of the questionnaire.
- Questionnaire demonstrates considerable opposition.
- Questionnaire should have been undertaken by the PC.
- The proposed housing is purely an enabling development to fund a new church car park and graveyard.

6.30 Character & Appearance

- Houses are too large.
- Design of the houses is too uniform.
- Very large houses will overshadow the Church.
- Overdevelopment.
- Loss of green space.
- Out of character with Church Lane.
- Infill developments on Church Lane have historically been resisted.

6.31 Amenity

- Overlooking and loss of privacy.
- Fly tipping and antisocial behaviour resulting from the car park.
- Overbearing.
- Disruption from construction works.
- Noise impact from traffic and social activity at the new dwellings.

### 6.32 Ecology & Biodiversity

- Impact on protected species at nursery site.
- Disappointed to see the absence of any recommendations for the inclusion of bird boxes to enhance biodiversity in the Ecological Assessment.
- Request that planning consent for the above-mentioned development includes a requirement for internal nest sites for Swifts.

## 7.0 **POLICY**

### 7.1 **National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

7.2 **Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016** - COM2 (Settlement Hierarchy), 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).

### 7.3 Awbridge Neighbourhood Plan

Awbridge Parish Council submitted an application for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area covering the parish of Awbridge. This was subject to public consultation running from 23rd March to 11th May 2018. The Council has considered the application and the responses received during the consultation and has approved the designation. The designation of a Neighbourhood Area would enable a Neighbourhood Plan to be prepared for the designated area. This consultation only considered whether a Neighbourhood Area should be designated and upon its proposed boundary.

## 8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main planning considerations are the principle of development, character of the area and the setting of heritage assets, highways, amenity, flood risk, ecology and biodiversity.

### 8.1 **Principle of development**

The site lies outside the settlement boundary identified for Awbridge, therefore is within the countryside. On this basis, the proposal would need to satisfy criterion a) or b). The proposal is promoted on the basis of policy COM9, which is referred to in criterion a) of COM2.

8.2 Paragraph 5.113 of the Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 states that:

*The Localism Act 2011 recognises that communities should have opportunities to take responsibility for promoting residential development in order to help support local services and facilities. These proposals should be led by the parish council and could come forward through a neighbourhood plan or parish plan. Exceptionally proposals can be led by interested parties provided that they can demonstrate that there has been extensive parish council and community involvement and the proposals are supported. The Council will support proposals initiated by the community provided they are justified and have local support.*

- 8.3 Policy COM9 provides the framework for considering development which will meet community needs and help support facilities and states that community led development will be permitted provided that:
- a) the proposal is supported by evidence that there is a need for the development to maintain or enhance the sustainability of the settlement through the delivery of community benefit; and
  - b) it is demonstrated that the community has been involved in the preparation of the proposal; and
  - c) it is demonstrated that the community supports the proposal; and
  - d) the proposal, if for residential development, helps meet the affordable housing need of the parish in accordance with the thresholds contained within policy COM7 and local evidence and restrictions contained within policy COM8.

8.4 **Need, Sustainability and Community Benefit**

The Planning Statement submitted in support of the application sets out the reasons for the need for the development as the lack of parking provision at the church and the need to provide for more burial space.

- 8.5 With regard to the parking provision the church currently has no car park and it is stated that larger events result in significant on street parking resulting in a safety issue for pedestrian and vehicular users of Church Lane. The lack of parking is also started to be restricting the options for wider use of the church by the community. As a result the proposals put forward are for the provision of a car park adjacent to the church.

- 8.6 Further details of the level of services and functions (pre Covid) at the church have been provided and are summarised by the applicant as follows;
- Approximately 75 services per year. These vary in size of congregation from 37 (the average Sunday morning service based on last year's returns) to over 200 people for some Festivals, Weddings and Funerals.
  - The local school is now using the church for all their festival services, plays etc. These have congregations/audiences of up to 225 people regularly.
  - The church is also used on a regular basis for midweek meetings, both morning and evenings.
  - The village lunch club meets fortnightly where many of the more elderly villagers enjoy meeting others from the community.
  - The church is currently in the process of reordering its accommodation to provide a more useful space which will allow further and different use by the community, such as a drop in coffee meeting place, space for concerts and exhibitions. These activities will not conflict with the current use of the village hall and will in fact add benefit to the village community life.

- 8.7 Whilst it is understood that the church was operating with a finite amount of burial space the original submission did not include details of the current provision and anticipated demand which has now been proved as follows;
- Burials over the last 5.5 years = 19
  - Burials of ashes over the last 5 years = 9
  - Burial spaces available = 21
  - Faculty reservation of grave spaces = 10
- 8.8 The submitted information anticipates that the currently available spaces could be taken up in two to five years. Whilst it is not possible to be certain of such an estimate it is accepted that there is a finite supply of space and that it is reasonable to anticipate continued demand for burials (inclusive of ashes) from the village population. As a result at some point the available space will be diminished and, based on the information available, the adjacent land made available through the current application, has been the only solution to have made significant progress. It is therefore not considered to be unreasonable for the church to be seeking a long term solution to this issue.
- 8.9 Whilst it is clear from the submission the primary function of the proposed dwellings is to enable the provision of the works at the church there is some benefit associated with the economic investment associated with the construction works and future economic and social benefit associated with the future occupiers. However such benefits are clearly modest and the bulk of the consideration of community benefit rests on the provision of the car park and graveyard extension.
- 8.10 Representations have raised concern that the church does not constitute a community facility, particularly in comparison to the village hall which benefits from public funding and is more secular in nature. However it is considered that the church represents a community facility beyond just Sunday services and that the provision of the car park would facilitate the use of the facilities by the wider community and limit the impact of larger functions and services on the adjacent highways.
- 8.11 The provision of the graveyard extension would address a long standing space issue and enable long term provision of burials in the village.
- 8.12 In addition there are some modest social and economic benefits from the construction and occupation of the dwellings.
- 8.13 In this case it is accepted that the development would help sustain existing community facilities and contribute significantly to the sustainability of the community.
- 8.14 **Community Involvement**  
The nature and extent of community involvement and the role of the Parish Council has been the subject of many of the representations of objection. The extent of what constitutes the community as it relates to this application has also been queried.

8.15 Parish Council Involvement

As is indicated in the Local Plan proposals should be “led by the parish council and could come forward through a neighbourhood plan or parish plan. Exceptionally proposals can be led by interested parties provided that they can demonstrate that there has been extensive parish council and community involvement and the proposals are supported.”

8.16 As is stated in para 7.3 the Awbridge neighbourhood plan has not progressed passed the initial stages and as a result no public consultation beyond the principle of a neighbourhood area and its boundary have been undertaken. However it is noted that the neighbourhood plan application included the whole of Awbridge Parish and noted that the parish functions as a single community.

8.17 Awbridge Parish Council have expressed support for the application as most recently amended. Representations have raised concerns as to the procedure that led to this decision. However it is not the purpose of this report to assess the processes of the Parish Council who have clearly expressed their democratic decision and provided a detailed timeline of their involvement in the development of the scheme and its community consultation (Appendix A).

8.18 It is clear from the most recent PC comments in response to a representation that they feel that their, and the communities, involvement has been substantive. Specifically the comments conclude that “it has been clearly shown that the Parish Council has been involved with the project from initial conception to the application as it now stands. At all times we have been open to views both for and against the proposal, encouraging dialogue between the community, residents and applicants, where significant changes to the plans have been made in response to issues identified.”

8.19 In this case it is clear that the Parish themselves believe that their involvement has been extensive and have expressed support as is required by Policy COM9.

8.20 Other community involvement

Outside of the community engagement through the Parish Councils involvement it is apparent that other consultations, exhibitions and meetings have been undertaken.

8.21 The application submission states that and public consultation event was held at the Church (Sept 2019) to inform the public about the scheme. Approximately 60 people are stated to have attended the event and 66 questionnaire responses returned. Some representations have raised concern that the event was not properly advertised and that Church Lane residents were not in attendance.

8.22 Subsequent public engagement was through the Parish Councils own meetings (Nov 19 to June 20) and followed by the submission of the planning application. The most notable change at this time was the reduction in the number of proposed dwellings from four to three.

- 8.23 Public access via the Parish Council meetings has continued throughout the application but further attempts to arrange discussions between those neighbour in the near vicinity of the site and the applicants were restricted. Various attempts to agree a mediated meeting were unsuccessful but meetings were eventually held in January and February of 2021 mediated by a member of the Parish Council.
- 8.24 Test Valley Council were not party to those discussions and so an assessment of their content is limited to the public representations available and the covering letter from the applicant's agent which accompanied amended plans submitted at the end of February 2021. That the meetings were not open to the public and restricted to three representatives of Church Lane residents limits their significance as a community engagement exercise in relation to COM9. However it is clear that those discussions, and subsequent discussion of the proposed changes with TVBC Officers, did result in amendments to the scheme.
- 8.25 It was this amended scheme that was the subject of the Parish Council comments and referenced in the notification to Awbridge residents via the local newsletter that produced no further representations.
- 8.26 In this case it is considered that the Parish Council and Community has been extensively involved in the evolution and development of the scheme as is required by Policy COM9.
- 8.27 **Community Support**  
The originally submitted scheme was subject to a survey of all Awbridge parish households via a local newsletter. In summary 558 questionnaires were delivered and 199 responses were received (response rate of 35.7%). 291 (72.9%) persons were recorded as supporting the scheme and 108 (27.1%) as being against. Representations have raised concerns with regard to the format of the survey and that the Parish Council did not take a more direct involvement. In addressing that point the Parish Council have commented that they agreed a supervisory role with the applicants and that responses were opened under that supervision. This process is stated to have resulted in 5 responses being discounted as a result of being form outside of Awbridge Parish.
- 8.28 Notwithstanding the submitted concerns the survey remains the most comprehensive account of the views of Awbridge Parish available. As is summarised above there have also been a significant number of direct representations to the planning application. These are generally more evenly distributed.
- 8.29 Some representations have sought to apply a narrower definition of community or to attach more weight to the comments those living in proximity to the proposals. However relevance of the facilities at the church and those proposed by the application go beyond the immediate vicinity and the community in this instance is considered to be reasonably defined as the Parish of Awbridge.

8.30 In addition some representations have expressed broad support for development that enables the provision of the car park and graveyard extension but have raised objections to this specific scheme mostly with regard to the quantum of development.

8.31 When considered in conjunction with the Parish Council support, who are the community representatives of the parish, on balance it is accepted that there is a clear demonstration of support from the community for the application, in compliance with Policy COM09(c).

8.32 **Affordable Housing**

Awbridge is classed as an undesignated area and therefore, under Policy COM7 applies. Policy COM7 states that the Council will negotiate on housing sites of 11-14 dwellings (or sites of 0.34 – 0.49ha) for up to 30% of dwellings to be affordable. Therefore based upon the number of proposed dwellings (3), the trigger for Affordable Housing has not been met, and therefore no provision of Affordable Housing will be required. However, the site size of land measures 1.0ha, and this does fall within the above parameters. The above area of land is broadly equivalent to the size of site (excluding constraints) reasonably expected to deliver the number of dwellings in that step of the sliding scale, assuming an average density of development. The purpose of the equivalent site area threshold is to avoid any applicant being able to deliberately reduce the number of dwellings below a threshold purely in order to reduce the amount of affordable housing able to be sought, when in planning terms a higher number of dwellings could be appropriately accommodated.

8.33 In this case approximately a third of the site is required for the provision of the community facilities and ecological mitigation. In addition the proximity to the heritage asset and the character of the lane, combined with the community led aspect of the scheme, have reduced the developable area. In this case it is not considered that there has been any deliberate effort to artificially reduce the number of dwellings below the threshold. As a result the number of dwellings falls below the trigger and the developable area falls below the area threshold and the provision of Affordable is not triggered. In this respect the proposal does not include any affordable housing, which is in accordance with Policy COM09(d).

8.34 Conclusion in relation to Policy COM9

For the reasons set out above the proposed development is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy COM9 and is acceptable in principle. However other issues relevant to the principle of development have been raised and are considered in more detail below.

8.35 Viability & Alternative Schemes

Policy COM9 has no viability component. That is to say that the applicant does not need to show the proposal is viable, or not. In addition, there is no requirement for the applicant to only propose a minimal amount of development that would generate sufficient funds to enable the community benefit. The application is, nevertheless, supported by details of viability however the purpose of that information is limited to providing publicly

available evidence of the cost associated with the provision of the community benefit. These details have been publicly available throughout the application process for assessment by members of the public in determining their support or otherwise for the proposals.

- 8.36 A group of Church Lane residents have commissioned a viability assessment which is stated to show that a reduced quantum of development is required to provide the community facilities. It is stated that an alternative scheme on that basis has been put forward by the owners of a neighbouring property. The two viability appraisals are similar in most regards other than the value assigned to the existing nursery site.
- 8.37 However there is no evidence to suggest that an alternative scheme based on a reduced number of dwellings has been agreed with the applicants or land owner. In this instance the current landowner has made representation expressly stating that they would not be willing to facilitate the proposals. In any event no such alternative planning application exists and the current application must be determined on its own merits. The recommendation has had no regard to the various viability appraisals produced by parties given that Policy COM09 does not require such a consideration. They are irrelevant to this particular proposal.
- 8.38 Loss of the nursery site
- 8.39 The existing horticultural site does not appear to benefit from any specific planning permission for its structures and activities. This is likely as a result of the land being used in horticultural use which falls within the legal definition of what comprises “agriculture” under the Planning Acts (Section 55). Alternating between agricultural and horticultural uses does not represent development for the purposes of the Planning Act. It is apparent that the horticultural activities have reduced on site in recent years. Policy COM9 is essentially silent on the existing use of an application site. That the proposals would result in the loss of the nursery is clear and has not resulted in any representations seeking its retention and as a result there is considered to be no conflict with Policy COM9.
- 8.40 **Housing Land Supply**  
Section 5 of the NPPF relates to housing. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires the Council to demonstrate a minimum of 5 years housing land supply (HLS) with a 5% buffer. An assessment of the HLS position as at 30 November 2020 has been undertaken. This uses the housing requirement established in policy COM1 and has regard to the conclusions of the Inspector’s Report on the Examination of the Local Plan. The HLS position for Northern Test Valley, as at 1 April 2020 is 6.27 years of supply. This is reported against a target of 5.00 years. The existence of a five year HLS enables the Council to give weight to the policies of the adopted plan (in the context of footnote 7). The demonstration of a five year HLS does not in itself cap development and any application must be assessed on its merits.

#### 8.41 **Character and Appearance**

Currently the site has a treed boundary along Church Lane but views over the horticultural site and associated polytunnels are readily available from the access, albeit predominantly obscured from longer views. Church Lane is characterised by detached properties of a wide variety of designs and materials set in generally large to very large plots. Boundaries are generally well planted.

#### 8.42 Setting of the Heritage Assets

The Church of All Saints is listed at Grade II, and was built in 1876 from squared rubble Swanage stone and Bath stone, which is unusual for this area. It has a long tiled roof and a spired bell tower. The church is on land which used to belong to the Awbridge Danes estate, and it was designed by J. Colson. As is noted in the heritage statement he was a Victorian architect, based in Winchester, whose work was principally churches and other associated buildings. Awbridge Danes house is listed at Grade II\* at is at some distance from the church to the south-west and its listed park (GII) extends up to the boundary of the churchyard and the proposed development site.

8.43 The church is on a corner in the lane with its historic vicarage set further down the road to the south-east. There has been some modern development along the lane, notably the houses to the south of the church, and to the north-west, which have altered its setting to an extent. The land subject to this application, though, seems largely the same as shown in maps from around the time the church was built (in as much as it is not formally developed, and gives a sense of openness around the church).

8.44 The Conservation Officer raised some initial concern with regard to the impact of the car park, specifically due to its location forward of the church and the formality of the originally proposed layout. Whilst no objection was raised initially to the graveyard extension the Conservation Officer has expressed support for the revised scheme. The relocation of the carpark to the rear, and the siting of the graveyard extension at the front of the site are considered significant improvements. Graveyards are a typical feature in the setting of historic churches, and therefore it will conserve and enhance the setting of the church. The open, green, nature of the graveyard should also allow a better appreciation of the church from the corner than the carpark would have done, and create a buffer between the church and the new dwellings.

8.45 The three proposed dwellings each have an individual design (all working generally from the 'Arts and Crafts' genre) which prevents the development looking too uniform. To create further diversity, the Conservation Officer has suggested a subtly different palette of materials could be used for each house and a condition requiring the approval of materials has been applied.

8.46 The revised design is considered to be preferable in the historic setting and will better reveal the significance of the heritage assets. Subject to control over materials the proposals are considered to have no adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets and comply with Policy E9.

8.47 Landscape & Arboriculture

The Landscape Officer has echoed the comments of the Conservation Officer that the revised design including the reduced scale and revised layout of the car park and graveyard extension is a significant improvement. The removal of the community garden also provides the properties with more appropriately sized gardens, more in character with that of the neighbouring properties.

8.48 The Landscape Officer has however commented that the proposals include the retention of non-native species in the frontage planting and has advocated their removal. The Officer has also noted the lack of lighting in the car park which is encouraged. It is recommended that full details of landscape planting and any proposed lighting be secured by condition. Subject to the required conditions the proposals are considered to have no adverse impact on the landscape character of the site and comply with Policy E2.

8.49 Whilst no trees on site are subject to preservation orders the existing planting contributes to the character of the area and its retention where possible is preferable. The application is supported by an appropriate arboricultural method statement but an update reflecting the change to the church car park location will be required and is secured by condition.

8.50 Subject to the required conditions the proposals are considered to have no adverse impact on the landscape character of the site and comply with Policy E2.

8.51 **Highways**

Representations have been submitted both in support and objection on highways matters. The support relates primarily to the provision of the car park to avoid on-street parking, in particular in relation to larger events at the church. The representations of objection have raised concern that the existing on-street parking is not significant and that the provision of the car park and three new dwellings would be detrimental to highways safety in the locality.

8.52 The Highways Officer has advised that the combined impact of the residential development and the church car park raises no significant concerns. The volume of traffic associated with three residential dwellings would not be considered to be at a material detrimental level of impact to the safety and efficiency of Church Lane or the wider highway network.

8.53 The Highways Officer has further advised that the proposed car park would likely provide a net benefit to the existing situation of vehicle parking on the highway in Church Lane. The Highways Officer also accepted that the Church's plans to diversify will likely result in an increase in ad-hoc events, however the introduction of newly created off-street parking will likely result in minimal impact during any peak hours.

- 8.54 Vehicular visibility at the proposed Church access falls marginally below standards in the primary direction at 39m. Given the nature of Church Lane, this marginal decrease in standards has been assessed and is considered to be acceptable given the likely 85th percentile wet weather speeds in the location. The use of a 2m “X” distance is also considered acceptable given the characteristics of Church Lane and the similarity to visibility levels for most other access points in the vicinity.
- 8.55 The proposed parking arrangement would meet the required standard and, subject to further conditions requiring the retention of parking, visibility splays and restricting the location of any gates, the proposed scheme is considered to have no significant detrimental impact on highways or pedestrian safety and accords with the relevant T policies of the TVBRLP 2016.
- 8.56 **Residential Amenities**  
There are two elements to the consideration of amenity. Firstly is the amenity of the future residents of the development site and secondly the impact of the proposal upon the amenity of existing neighbouring properties.
- 8.57 Impact on existing dwellings  
The nearest neighbouring property is Winchurch which is situated approximately 20m from the westernmost dwelling at the nearest point. However this is a side to side relationship with some significant screening between the properties. As a result it is not considered that the development would result in any significant overbearing or overlooking impact.
- 8.58 Representations have raised concern with regard to overlooking impact to neighbouring properties on the northern side of Church Lane. However the nearest dwelling (Coombe End) is situated approximately 45m from the nearest of the proposed dwellings and as a result the proposals are not considered to result in any significant overlooking impact.
- 8.59 The revised location of the car park has moved it closer to the neighbouring property of Amberwell to the southeast. However a separation distance of approximately 44m is retained to the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. Whilst regular use of the car park must be anticipated it is not considered likely to result in larger vehicle movements or a level of disturbance likely to have an impact on amenity by way of noise.
- 8.60 Impact on proposed dwellings  
The layout for the provision of the 3 dwellings provides for adequate private amenity space and avoid significant impacts on amenity by virtue of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing.
- 8.61 The easternmost plot is situated approximately 5m from the access track to the church car park at the nearest point. However, as is considered above, it is not considered likely to result in a level of noise disturbance likely to have an impact on amenity.

8.62 Impact during construction works

Representations have raised concern with regard to the impact of noise, mud and dust during construction works. Whilst some degree of disturbance is inevitable during construction work conditions can be applied to limit the hours of construction and to require an environmental management plan to limit amenity impacts. Subject to the required conditions the proposed development is considered to have no significant adverse impact on amenity and complies with TVBRLP Policies LHW4 and E8.

8.63 **Drainage and Flood Risk**

The application is supported by a Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Statement. The reports detail the proposed surface water drainage and conclude that, in accordance with the SuDS principles that the development would not result in additional runoff. Subject to a condition to ensure compliance with the submitted details the proposed development is not considered to result in adverse flood risk and complies with TVBRLP Policy E7.

8.64 **Water management**

The 2016 Local Plan includes a requirement in policy E7 to achieve a water consumption standard of no more than 100 litres per person today. This reflects the requirements of part G2 of the 2015 Building Regulations. In the event that planning permission was to be recommended a condition would be applied in order to address this. Subject to such a condition the proposal would comply with policy E7.

8.65 **Biodiversity & Protected Species**

Following initial concern raised by the Ecology Officer the application has been supported by revised and additional ecological survey work and biodiversity enhancement measures.

8.66 New Forest SPA

The development will result in a net increase in residential dwellings within 13.6km of the New Forest SPA. This distance defines the zone identified by recent research where new residents would be considered likely to visit the New Forest. The New Forest SPA supports a range of bird species that are vulnerable to impacts arising from increases in recreational use of the Forest that result from new housing development. While clearly one new house on its own would not result in any significant effects, it has been demonstrated through research, and agreed by Natural England that any net increase (even single or small numbers of dwellings) would have a likely significant effect on the SPA when considered in combination with other plans and projects.

8.67 To address this issue, Test Valley Borough Council has adopted a strategy whereby a scale of developer contributions has been agreed that would fund the delivery of measures to address these issues. With respect to the New Forest, a new strategic area of alternative recreational open space is being delivered that would offer the same sort of recreational opportunities as those offered by the New Forest. Subject to the required financial contribution the proposals would not have a significant adverse impact on the SPA.

8.68 Solent and Southampton Water SPA – Solent Neutrality

There is existing evidence of high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus 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 does not contribute to net increases in nutrients entering these designated sites.

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

8.70 The applicant has submitted information that quantifies the nutrient budget for the proposal. In this case, as a result of the relatively high nitrate input resulting from horticultural uses, the proposals would result in a reduction in total nitrates (-4.6 KG/N/Yr). Therefore this development would not have a likely significant effect on the designated Solent sites.

8.71 Great Crested Newts

Due to the lack of local records (within 1km) and small area of terrestrial habitat on site (majority of the site considered unsuitable), GCN are not considered likely to be present on site and impacted by the proposed development. Precautionary mitigation measures within the construction and occupational stage of the development have been outlined as a precautionary measure in the absence of any formal assessment.

8.72 The Ecology Officer has advised that, given the limited amount of suitable terrestrial habitat on site, and the lack of local records for the species, provided the proposed mitigation measures are implemented that a breach under the Habitats Regulations is considered unlikely. The precautionary measures detailed in the submitted ecological information are to be secured by condition.

8.73 Reptiles

A low population of slow worms and grass snakes were recorded on site within updated reptile surveys. 0.16ha of suitable habitat appears to currently be present on site, with approximately 0.158ha reptile receptor site being created as part of the proposed scheme, with two hibernacula being created. Mitigation measures and method statement for the relocation of reptiles has been proposed which the Ecology Officer has supported and are secured by condition. The reptile receptor site will need to be established prior to the commencement of the translocation programme.

8.74 Bats

In addition to securing suitable mitigation measures detailed within the ecological appraisal the Ecology Officer has also advised that details of any lighting are secured by condition.

8.75 SINC

The proposed development is adjacent to All Saints, Awbridge SINC (Site of Importance for Nature Conservation) which is a locally designated site, protected due to the presence of the rare Maidenhair Fern, and therefore is protected from the impacts of development under the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy E5 of the Revised Test Valley Local Plan DPD. As such any impact on such sites are a material planning consideration within the planning process, and any potential impacts should be appropriately mitigated.

8.76 Due to the presence of this species on site, the site is vulnerable to the impacts of the construction as well as the occupational phase of any development. Therefore the Ecology Officer has advised that, to prevent ongoing dust pollution from the proposed car park, washed gravel and plastic retaining matrix should be used within the proposed scheme. This is secured by condition.

8.77 Subject to the required conditions the development is considered to have no adverse impact on protected species and complies with Policy E5.

8.78 **Planning balance**

The application site remains in the countryside area as defined by the local plan. However, as detailed above, the proposals are considered to comply with the requirements of Policy COM9 and are therefore acceptable in principle. Paragraph of the TVBRLP is clear that the Council will support proposals initiated by the community provided they are justified and have local support.

8.79 Beyond the considerations of COM9 the proposals have been amended and supported by additional information and it is concluded that the site is appropriate for the development, in planning and delivery terms, and consideration has been given to all reasonable options.

8.80 Social Benefits

In terms of social benefits the proposal would provide for community benefit by the provision of the church car park and extension to the graveyard. There is also a modest social benefit in the provision of additional housing, albeit not affordable.

8.81 Economic Benefits

In line with residential development of this scale there would be economic benefits from the proposed development through employment and additional spending power resulting from the construction phase and from future occupiers of the proposed development. The economic benefits of the car park are harder to quantify and so only limited weight is afforded to this particular point in the planning balance leading to a recommendation to grant planning permission.

8.82 The proposal is acceptable in principle and is considered to have no significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the application site, amenities of neighbouring properties, highways safety or protected species. The proposal therefore complies with the relevant policies of the TVBRLP 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## 9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 The proposed development complies with Policy COM9 and is acceptable in principle. Potential concerns with regard to the impact protected species and biodiversity have been resolved. Subject to securing the required conditions and s106 obligations the proposed development is considered acceptable.

## 10.0 RECOMMENDATION

10.1 **Delegate to Head of Planning & Building for completion of satisfactory consultation with Natural England and s106 legal agreement to secure;**

- **New Forest SPA contribution.**
- **Future management of landscaped and biodiversity enhancement areas outside of residential garden areas.**
- **Delivery and transfer of the church car park and graveyard extension.**

**Then 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. **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.**
3. **Notwithstanding the submitted details no development shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until a revised scheme for the protection of trees to be retained, reflecting the change to the church car park location, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include a plan showing the location and specification of tree protective barriers. Such barriers shall be erected prior to any other site operations and at least three working days' notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority that it has been erected.  
Note: The protective barriers shall be as specified at Chapter 6.2 and detailed in figure 2 of B.S.5837:2012 unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.**

**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 (2016).**

- 4. Tree protective measures installed (in accordance with the tree protection condition 3) 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.**

- 5. 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.**

- 6. No development shall take place above DPC level 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. 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 soft landscape proposals shall include details of soft boundary treatments to the outside edges of the site. Notwithstanding the submitted information suitable soft landscape proposals should be native species chosen to provide screening whilst retaining an informal character in the rural area. The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme and in accordance with the management plan. To prevent ongoing dust pollution from the proposed car park, washed gravel and plastic retaining matrix shall be used within the proposed church car park unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**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.**

- 7. The development of the dwellings 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.**

- 8. 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 building(s) is/are occupied. External lighting will follow best practice guidelines outlined by the Bat Conservation Trust and the Institute of Lighting Professionals (Guidance note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK). Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and in the interests of protected species in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policies E5 and E8.**
- 9. The dwellings hereby approved shall be designed and built to meet Regulation 36 2 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015.**

**Reason: In the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 10. There shall be no construction or demolition works, no machinery shall be operated, no processes carried out and no deliveries received or dispatched outside the following times: 07:30 to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturday. In addition, no such activities shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public holidays.**

**Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan policies E8 and LWH4.**
- 11. In the event that contamination is found at any time during demolition and/or construction works, the presence of such contamination shall be reported in writing to the Local Planning Authority without delay and development shall be suspended on the affected part of the site until a remediation scheme for dealing with that contamination has been approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved remediation scheme shall be implemented and, if requested, a verification report, for the purpose of certifying adherence to the approved remediation scheme, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the site being brought in to use.**

**Reason: To ensure a safe living/working environment in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 policy E8.**
- 12. No development shall take place unless or until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall cover the control of noise, dust and spoil during the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of development. The Construction Environmental Management Plan shall include the provision of wheel washing, and any other suitable facility, to avoid the deposit of spoil onto the highway network. Work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Environmental Management Plan.**

**Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan policies E8, T1 and LWH4.**

- 13. Prior to the commencement of development full details of the layout for the parking and manoeuvring onsite of contractor's and delivery vehicles during the construction period shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of development and retained for the duration of the construction period. Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 policy T1.**
- 14. The development shall not be brought into use until vehicular visibility splays as indicated on the approved plans in which there should be no obstruction to visibility exceeding 1.0m in height above the adjacent carriageway channel line have been completed. Such visibility splays shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development. Reason: To provide and maintain adequate visibility in the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 policy T1.**
- 15. The drainage system shall be constructed in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy; ref: 115.5003/FRA&DS/1. Surface water discharge to the watercourse shall be limited to 2.0 l/s. Any changes to the approved documentation must be submitted to and approved in writing by Local Planning Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority. Any revised details submitted for approval must include a technical summary highlighting any changes, updated detailed drainage drawings and detailed drainage calculations. Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings. The submitted details shall include;**
- a. Maintenance schedules for each drainage feature type and ownership.**
  - b. Details of protection measures.**
- Maintenance and protection measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and in the interest of local amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E7.**
- 16. Development shall proceed in accordance with the measures set out in Section 6.0 'Recommendations' of the Land off Church Lane, Awbridge, Ecological Assessment (Ecosupport, 31 March 2021). Thereafter, all mitigation and enhancement features shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details. Prior to commencement, a detailed planting plan and ongoing management strategy for the site shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval. Development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details, with photographic evidence of these measures submitted to the LPA within 6 months of occupation.**

**Reason: To ensure the favourable conservation status of protected species and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan DPD.**

- 17. Prior to commencement a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and method statement, incorporating measures to avoid impacts on the designated sites, habitats and species during the construction phase of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should include:**

- a) Biosecurity measures**
- b) Arrangements for the routing of machinery on site**
- c) Pollution prevention measures, e.g. dust and run-off**
- d) Mitigation for protected species, such as avoidance and protection of suitable habitat**
- e) Storage of materials**
- f) Minimising noise and vibration**
- g) Ecological supervision of works**
- h) Lighting**

**Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with any such approved details.**

**Reason: To protect designated sites, habitats and species in accordance with Policy E5 of the Revised Test Valley Local Plan DPD.**

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

- D-100**
- D-111 E**
- D-112 A**
- D-114 B**
- D-210 B**
- D-220 B**
- D-230 B**

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

**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.**
-