
APPLICATION NO.	21/02575/VARS
APPLICATION TYPE	VARIATION OF CONDITIONS - SOUTH
REGISTERED	16.09.2021
APPLICANT	Mr David Hemsley
SITE	The Black Horse , West Tytherley, Salisbury, SP5 1NF, WEST TYTHERLEY AND FRENCHMOOR
PROPOSAL	Variation of condition 2 and 10 of planning permission 16/02056/FULLS (Erection of 3 bedroom chalet bungalow) to amend approved plans to include raised foundation height, raised height of ground floor windows, replacement of two windows on eastern elevation with french doors and to decrease the pitch of the roof, amend details of landscaping
AMENDMENTS	<u>16th September 2021</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PTAD/130821/05 Shadow diagram• Updated proposal wording• Design and Access Statement
CASE OFFICER	Sarah Barter

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of members because 'it raises issues of more than local public interest'.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The application site lies within the defined settlement boundary of West Tytherley, opposite the recreation ground to the rear of the Grade II listed pub (The Black Horse) and is set back from the road. The area where the dwelling is currently built to first floor lies to the south of the pub and extends to the rear of the building, rising in level towards the western boundary. The site is dominated by a large sycamore tree which is covered by a Tree Preservation Order and visible within the surrounding area.

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 Variation of condition 2 and 10 of planning permission 16/02056/FULLS (Erection of 3 bedroom chalet bungalow) to amend approved plans to include raised foundation height, raised height of ground floor windows, replacement of two windows on eastern elevation with french doors and to decrease the pitch of the roof, amend details of landscaping

3.2 Planning permission has previously been granted for a dwelling at this site, see paragraph 4.2 below. The building of this dwelling has started on site and at the time of report writing is up to first floor height.

4.0 HISTORY

4.1 18/02175/FULLS - Installation of a domestic sewerage treatment plant – Permission subject to conditions and notes - 26th October 2018

4.2 16/02056/FULLS - Erection of a 3 bedroom chalet bungalow – Permission subject to conditions and notes – 17th April 2017

4.3 15/02991/FULLS - Erection of new chalet dwelling (resubmission of 15/01576/FULLS) – Withdrawn, April 2016.

4.4 15/01576/FULLS - Erection of a new chalet dwelling (amended scheme following withdrawal of application 14/00733/FULLS) – Withdrawn, August 2015.

4.5 14/00733/FULLS - 1 No detached chalet style dwelling – Withdrawn, May 2014.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 Conservation – No Objection

5.2 Highways – No Objection

6.0 REPRESENTATIONS Expired 03.11.2021

6.1 West Tytherley PC – Objection 17.09.2021 (summarised)

- Size and scale for the plot within which the property sits, particularly for the proposed roofline which will be overbearing
- loss of light for neighbours
- Continues to reflect the conversion from bungalow to a house with a first floor.
- Inaccurate drawings
- Negative impact upon Streetscene - design is out of character with the area
- Deep concern regarding seemingly endless applications to vary this planning application.
- Building work has reached the point where the applicant is now in effect making a retrospective application

West Tytherley PC – Objection 12.10.2021 (summarised)

- The viability and approval status of 16/02056/FULLS is intrinsically flawed: it is now evident that the original design was never viable if the tree was to be protected.
- WTPC consider S73 of the Town and Country Planning Act is not an appropriate route to seek a variation to what amounts to a fundamental alteration in both design and character of the dwelling and its setting as a whole.

- Due to the close proximity to the historic barn adjacent and the listed public house to the front of the site, the roof height/pitch would no longer meet the test of being modestly proportionated and recessive within the street scene. The roof will be categorically more prominent/visible.
- We do not believe the harm can be weighed more favourably against the public benefits of the proposal; the build has not been community led, is not required for the operation of the business, and would be a low-grade addition to the local housing stock.
- Landscaping plans being proposed in order to mitigate the overlooking issue caused by the increase in ridge height and window height will have the knock-on effect of creating a loss of amenity of neighbours by way of overshadowing.
- There is no BRE Guidelines 45-degree rule assessment report measuring the impact on sunlight and daylight to all neighbouring properties as a direct result of the proposed landscaping.
- The neighbours hedge to provide amenity to the garden is not enforceable. We understand the hedge has been deemed unsafe and is scheduled for removal this Autumn
- Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that Effective enforcement is important to maintain public confidence in the planning system. To seek remedy to the harm done would mean reducing the ridge height to the approved 6370mm and as such a 1.5 storey dwelling would not meet Building Regulations.

6.2 Walnut Lodge, Strongs Barn – Objection (summarised)

- Issues with the validity and determination of the application
- Major Material Planning Considerations which have changed since the last Approval
- Relevant National Policy Considerations
- Overlooking
- Continued inaccuracies in the Applicants proposals/plans
- No guarantee that the proposed plan corresponds to what has actually been built.
- Inadequate landscaping proposed
- Loss of light
- Cramped substandard upper floor to compensate for the mistake in the level of the foundations.
- The of relevance of Emerging Plans
- The standing objection raised by Highways in a previous iteration of the application cannot just be ignored as part of this current feedback and we'd ask how this will be dealt with?
- Please can you advise us how we ensure this development will not result in loss of parking and more cars being parked on the road or blocking drive ways because there isn't enough room within the pub carpark?
- It is also noted that the National Planning Framework now includes for detailed guidance on lines of sight and privacy considerations from new developments. Since this is a new introduction and therefore new guidance, please confirm how this has been included in your consideration as part of the new application process?

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 hierarchy

E1 – High quality development in the Borough

E2 – Protect, conserve and enhance the landscape character of the Borough

E5 – Biodiversity

E7 – Water management

E8 - Pollution

E9 – Heritage

LHW4 – Amenity

T1 – Managing movement

T2 – Parking standards

7.3 Neighbourhood Plan

Draft West Tytherley and West Dean Neighbourhood Plan

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Siting layout and design
- Impact on trees
- Heritage
- Amenity
- Highway Matters
- Ecology
- Nitrate Neutrality
- Other matters

8.2 **Principle of Development**

Test Valley Revised Borough Local Plan 2016

The application site lies within the settlement boundary for West Tytherley, as defined by the Revised Local Plan (RLP). Policy COM2 states that within the boundaries of settlements, the principle of development and redevelopment will be permitted, provided that it is appropriate to the other policies of the RLP. As such in addition to the existing extant planning permission detailed in paragraph 4.2 above, the principle of residential development on this site is therefore considered acceptable, subject to consideration of the detail of the proposals against the other policies contained within the RLP.

8.3 Emerging West Tytherley and West Dean Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

The West Dean and West Tytherley Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the independent examiner on 22 September 2021. Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) indicates the considerations when giving weight to relevant policies in emerging plans. In this context, limited weight can be given to the draft NDP.

8.4 Asset of Community Value

A comment has been received in respect of the Black Horse pub being an asset of community value. The comment discusses the potential loss of parking spaces at the public house. Highway and parking matters are discussed below.

8.5 The Case Officer has reviewed the application site and the Assets of Community Value information the Council holds. The application site is not included in the assets of community value area plan and therefore this has no weight in the consideration of the planning application.

8.6 **Siting, Layout & Design**

Policy E1 of the adopted RLP seeks to secure high quality development within the Borough, stating the development will be permitted if it is of a high quality in terms of design and local distinctiveness, and sets a number of criteria to be complied with. These include the need for development to integrate, respect and complement the character of the area, in terms of layout, appearance, scale, materials and building style. It goes on to state that development will not be permitted if it is of poor design and fails to improve the character, function and quality of an area.

8.7 This is supported by Policy E2, which seeks to ensure the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape of the Borough, again setting a number of criteria against which development proposals are to be assessed. It states that development will be permitted provided, amongst other criteria, it does not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the immediate area and the landscape character within which it is located, and that the retention of important landscape features is not likely to be prejudiced. It also requires existing and proposed landscaping features to enable the proposal to integrate positively into the landscape character of the area.

8.8 The proposal retains the design of the dwelling presented in the permitted planning application 16/02056/FULLS with three bedrooms proposed in the chalet style roof and living accommodation at ground floor. The proposed dwelling would be visible in views of the site from the street frontage and surrounding road as the dwelling sits on the highest part of the site. However, now and when completed it would be viewed against neighbouring properties which are set at similar and in some instances higher levels and are visible in views of the site from the road frontage, recreation ground and surrounding area. As such, the dwelling would not appear in isolation in views of the site, nor as out of keeping with the prevailing character of the surrounding Conservation Area. The dwelling would also be partially screened by the existing outbuilding and by the surrounding trees and shrubs, particularly in summer months.

8.9 The changes proposed to the windows at ground floor on the eastern elevation would be visible from the wider area but it is not considered that the addition of French doors in this location would result in an unacceptable design. Openings were always proposed in this location on the building and viewed within the context of the existing dwelling and surrounding properties which vary in style and appearance its considered that this proposal would integrate,

respect and complement the character of the area, in terms of layout, appearance, scale, materials and building style.

- 8.10 The foundation height on the building has been raised and this has influenced the window/door heights and the pitch of the roof. Drawing PTAD/130821/05 shows the previously permitted design of the building in red and the version currently constructed and proposed in black. When viewed from beyond the pub car park on the main through fair of the village these changes of approx. 35cm in the window and door heights and the decrease of the roof pitch from 35 degrees to 30degrees are not considered to be significant changes which would result in an unacceptable level of harm on the surrounding area. In light of the above the proposal is considered to be accordance with policy E1 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.
- 8.11 Comments received set out that the NPPF now include detailed guidance of sight and privacy considerations for new developments. The comments also request confirmation that the consideration of this guidance has formed part of the new application process. The National Model Design Code referred to in the representations set out design considerations which local planning authorities will be expected to take into account when developing local design codes and guides and when determining planning applications. Test Valley Borough Council do not have any adopted design codes in place at this time. As such the relevant policy consideration is policy E1 set out above at paragraph 8.4.
- 8.12 **Impact on trees**
The footprint of the building will stay the same, so any impact on the trees from construction works is unlikely to alter. The current tree protection is appropriate, so provided this remains in place for the duration of the existing build it is not considered that the proposed development would create any significant impacts on the protected tree on site. Subject to appropriate conditions it is considered the development can be provided in accordance with Policy E2 of the RLP.
- 8.13 **Heritage**
The amendments proposed ensure that the building retains its modestly proportioned and recessive design. Due to the size of the building and its position in relation to the road, the building would not harm the setting of the pub and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be harmed. Heritage considerations have been considered previously on this site where the principle of a dwelling has been found to be acceptable. Block plans and sections have been submitted showing the proposed developments relationship with neighbouring heritage assets and the Case Officer and Conservation Officer have visited the Listed Building at Strongs Barn. Information has been submitted which is proportionate to the application now submitted where the principle of a dwelling very similar to that seen on site and with an overall height of the building which is slightly lower than as previously permitted is under consideration.

8.14 It is not considered that the proposed amendments to the development would result in any adverse degree of harm to the significance of the non designated and designated heritage assets. Furthermore the amendments are not considered to impact significantly on the Listed Building.

8.15 In light of these comments, it is considered that the proposed development would make a positive contribution to enhancing the significance of the heritage assets, in that the scheme responds positively to and is sympathetic to the existing character, appearance and setting of the surrounding conservation area and listed building. As such, it is considered that the proposed development complies with the aims of the NPPF and the requirements of Policy E9 of the RLP.

8.16 **Amenity**

Strongs Barn

Strongs Barn is a detached grade 2 listed residential property located to the north of the application site. A distance of approx. 3m is located between the northern elevation of the proposal and the boundary with Strongs Barn. Facing this neighbour are three windows which are proposed at ground floor and one rooflight. At the neighbouring property is a first floor window facing the application site together with single storey projection and a courtyard area together with garden. The application site is on a higher level than this neighbour and bounded by an approx. 2m high close board fence.

8.17 The Case Officer has visited both the application site and Strong's Barn. Whilst the dwelling would be visible from Strongs Barns garden it is not considered that its presence would create an unacceptable level of overshadowing or loss of light. Whilst the proposed dwelling would be located to the south of this neighbouring property the separation distance and design of the dwelling together with the presence of the close board boundary fence and proposed landscaping scheme would not result in any significant shadow being cast towards this neighbour. If any shadow were created it would be across a rear courtyard which houses an oil tank, the roof of the single storey projection and part of the grassed area immediately adjacent the boundary. The remaining garden would remain unaffected. In light of this it is not considered that a reason for refusal can be substantiated on these grounds. Furthermore taking into account the overall height of dwelling would not be any higher than that already permitted, the separation distance, the chalet style design of the development and that daylight would continue be received at the first floor window, courtyard and garden from other directions it is not considered that there would be any significant impacts in respect of loss of daylight at this neighbouring property and a reason for refusal cannot be sustained on these grounds.

8.18 In respect of overlooking the ground floor windows would be partially visible from this neighbouring properties rear garden and due to the elevated position the roof light would also be seen. The impacts of the overlooking from the proposal need to be considered in combination with boundary treatments and proposed conditions together with conditions already secured on the previous permission. As stated above the boundary has an approx. 2m high fence

located across it which partially screens the ground floor windows from view at Strongs Barn. Additional landscaping is also proposed adjacent these windows. At first floor the roof lights are proposed to be obscurely glazed and a condition has been applied to the recommendation to ensure no further dormer or roof lights are inserted into the roof space under permitted development. In light of the previous permission already granted for windows in these positions, the landscaping proposed and conditions for obscure glazing the impacts in respect of overlooking are not considered to be significant enough to result in a reason for refusal.

8.19 The proposed alterations to the ground floor windows to French doors on the eastern elevation may result in some oblique overlooking towards this neighbour but given it is not a direct view this impact would not be significant. Subject to appropriate conditions it is considered that the development can be provided in accordance with policy LHW4 of the Revised Borough Local Plan 2016.

8.20 Walnut Lodge

Walnut Lodge is a detached property located to the south of the application site. Walnut Lodge has a barn located to the rear garden which has recently been converted to living accommodation with a glazed link to the house. The boundary between the application site and this neighbour is formed of a close board fence of between approx 1.6m and 2m in height. On Walnut lodges side of the boundary adjacent the rear garden and patio areas are large mature evergreen trees, hedging and other shrubbery. The owner of the hedge at Walnut Lodge advises that this hedging will be removed as it is dead and dying and the leylandi is deemed unsafe (Tree application ref: 21/01888/TREES Removal of dead leylandi hedge from Northern boundary). A side walkway is also present as the boundary moves towards the road together with a garage/outbuilding.

8.21 The Case Officer has visited this neighbouring property. The proposed development is not located directly on the boundary with this neighbouring property but approx. 1.2m away which widens to over 2m at the widest points. It is also positioned to the north of this neighbouring boundary. Whilst it is noted that some of the shrubbery viewed on site within the neighbours garden will likely be removed, the remaining trees adjacent the boundary would be retained offering higher level screening from the development. In the winter months of evergreen trees were observed resulting in a continued presence of screening of the development throughout the year. Additional planting is also proposed on the application site side of this boundary. All light sources facing the development site would continue to receive light from other directions, any shadow cast by the development would fall away from this neighbour. In light of the above it is not considered that a reason for refusal in respect of loss of light, overshadowing or overbearing impacts could be substantiated and it is considered that the development can be provided at the separation distances mentioned without significant harm to this neighbouring property in this respect.

- 8.22 In relation to overlooking there are two openings at ground floor facing this neighbour – a window and front door and at first floor on the roof slope are three rooflights. Having visited the site case officer has viewed the ground floor openings in situ looking towards this neighbouring property. Whilst the internal floor level was not laid it is clear that any views out of these openings would be towards the boundary fence and overhanging shrubbery/branches only. Due to the level of the dwelling at one consistent level and the sloping of the ground up to the west at the neighbouring property (several stairs are climbed to access the barn conversion at Walnut Lodge) the proposal would not create any significant impacts towards this neighbouring property in this respect.
- 8.23 At first floor the roof lights are proposed across the roof slope. The impacts of the overlooking from the roof lights need to be considered in combination with the existing permission, the boundary treatments and proposed conditions and conditions already secured. At first floor the roof lights are proposed to be obscurely glazed and a condition has been applied to the recommendation to ensure no further dormer or roof lights are inserted into the roof space under permitted development. The separation distance between the barn building at Walnut Lodge and the boundary would be approx. 16m and drawing PTAD/130821/05 illustrates that there is no change to the heights of these openings it is only the roof pitch which has altered from 35 degrees to 30 degrees. Taking this account the existing boundary treatments, conditions and minor change in this respect to the permitted scheme it is not considered that any significant impact in terms of overlooking towards this neighbour would be created.
- 8.24 The two openings to create French doors on the eastern elevation were already permitted as windows. There is a window on the northern elevation at Walnut Lodge this is an obscured, opening bathroom window directly facing the application site to the north. A bathroom is considered to be a secondary room. The French doors face east and as such an oblique view maybe given to this bathroom window but given the oblique view and the type of room at Walnut Lodge it's not considered that any significant overlooking would be created in this respect.
- 8.25 Whilst the amendments have altered the placement of windows it is not considered that the changes outlined would amount to a reason for refusal in respect of impacts on neighbouring amenity. The proposals are considered acceptable and in accordance with the local plan policy LHW4.
- 8.26 Future occupiers
The amount and location of the outdoor space provided at the new dwelling is considered to be appropriate for a dwelling of the size and scale under consideration. Whilst the entire site may not be private when viewed from the pub car park it is likely the future occupants will find areas within this space which is measured at approx. 25m in depth by 13m in width, which are private for amenity purposes.

8.27 In respect of revised head heights at first floor in the revised building approx 3m in width would be available at a head height of 1.7m through the first floor (the height used in the general permitted development order when referring to potential overlooking from an adult from a side window). This is considered adequate for planning purposes. The submission is also subject to Building Control legislation.

8.28 **Highway Matters**

Policy T1 of the RLP states that development will be permitted providing, amongst other criteria, that the internal layout and access is 'safe, attractive, in character, functional and accessible for all users'. The pub car park is accessed from the main road, with a number of car parking spaces marked out. There is an existing gate between the outbuilding and the side elevation of the pub which provides access to the garden area – this is accessed through the car park and the application proposes that this would form the new vehicular access for the proposed dwelling, seen in the approved landscape drawings.

8.29 The site layout secured previously shows 2no parking spaces being provided at the south-eastern part of the site, this is also shown in a subsequent landscape plan submitted for conditions purposes for the previous application. This application to vary the landscaping information does not include any alteration to this. The Highways Officer has raised no objection to the proposals in terms of layout or highway safety concerns. Subject to a condition to ensure that the proposed spaces are provided prior to first occupation of the new dwelling. the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of the RLP.

8.30 Comments have been received in respect of a previous objection from the Highways Officer and that this objection has not been considered. Comments also outline that the pub will lose more spaces as a result of the development. The proposal does not include any alterations to the parking or access arrangements and the proposed changes do not impact on the ability to provide the development in the approved arrangement.

8.31 **Ecology**

New Forest SPA/SAC/Ramsar/SSSI

The application site lies within a 13.6km catchment area for the New Forest Special Protection Area (SPA), in which research has indicated there is a risk of increased visitor numbers and recreational pressure on the SPA, as a result of additional residential development within this area. This site supports a range of bird species which are vulnerable to impacts from increased recreational use of the sites, resulting from additional housing development. While one house on its own would not have a significant impact, it has been demonstrated through research, supported by Natural England, that any net increase in dwelling numbers would contribute to an in-combination likely significant effect on the identified Special Protection Area.

8.32 In order to address this impact, mitigation measures are required. With respect to the New Forest SPA, the Council has adopted the 'New Forest SPA Mitigation – Interim Framework' which proposes a number of mitigation options where it is considered that proposed development would result in a 'likely significant effect' on the interest features of the SPA. One such measure is a financial contribution of £1,300 per unit, to go towards the off-site provision of an area of 'suitable alternative natural greenspace'. This approach has previously been engaged on this application with the contribution secured on the 10th July 2017, no further contribution is sought.

8.33 Impact on Protected Species

Construction works have commenced for the previous permission at this application site and as such, the site comprises bare ground, managed grassland and the partly built development. It is considered the development can be provided without significant impacts on the protected species in accordance with policy E5 of the RBLP.

8.34 **Nitrate Neutrality**

The extant permission 16/02056/FULLS was permitted prior to the requirement of nitrate neutrality, and has since been implemented with the dwelling under construction. As the site is mid-construction it is not considered that a nitrogen budget is required in this instance.

8.35 **Other matters**

Inaccurate drawings

Comments have been received in respect of the submitted drawings and the accuracy of the information presented. It is unclear what the baseline information relied on for the inaccuracies is. No alternate information by an appropriately qualified individual has been provided to demonstrate where the inaccuracies are.

8.36 Section 73 application and material considerations

Comments have been received in respect of the validation of this application as a S73 submission. In this instance it is considered that a S73 application is appropriate form of application to consider the type of amendments sought. The amendments are material to the consideration of the application but as set out above are considered to be minor in nature and mitigated appropriately.

8.37 Removal of hedge between Walnut Lodge and the application site

Representations have been received in respect of control of the hedge which it is understood is within the ownership of the neighbour a Walnut Lodge and the maintenance of this hedge to screen the development. The recommendation does not rely solely on the presence of the boundary planting and does not require a condition ensuring its retention. The landscaping has been proposed within the application site and is able to be controlled by an appropriate condition.

8.38 The potential of the proposed dwelling not to pass Building Regulations
Comments made set out that the proposed dwelling would not pass building regs and in particular the windows. The Case Officer has sought the opinion of Building Control Officer. The Building Control Officer cannot see any adverse issues under Building Regulations with the revised heights shown. The first floor bedrooms should have suitable means of escape windows. In this case the first floor windows on the East and West elevations appear to be able to accommodate the required openings in accordance with building regs.

8.39 Other appeal decisions and applications in the Borough and the consideration of neighbour impacts
A representation received refers to a planning application in the Borough which raised concern in relation to neighbouring amenity and the application of policy in the same way. Each site is considered on its own merits and no two sites are directly comparable. The impacts on neighbouring amenity are discussed above.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 Subject to the conditions detailed below it is considered that the proposed amendments are acceptable and in accordance with the development plan.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

PERMISSION subject to:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in accordance with the details shown on the following submitted plans:**
 - Location Plan - drawing TV/157-LP Rev A**
 - Block Plan - drawing PTAD/130821/02**
 - Landscape proposals – drawing BH DLP 01**
 - Elevation section – drawing PTAD/130821/04**
 - Parking Section - drawing PTAD/110816/7**
 - Photo viewpoint – drawing PTAD/130821/06**
 - Proposed plans – drawing PTAD/130821/03**
 - Revised shadow diagram PTAD/130821/05**
 - Section North boundary BH DLP-02****Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**
2. **The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out in the submitted 'Arboricultural Tree Survey' (T P Marsh, Jan 2015) and the accompanying tree protection plan, drawing TM.871/02.**
Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction process, in accordance with Policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 3. The tree protection measures installed in accordance with Condition 2 shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of the works or until such time as otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities, materials storage, placement or site huts or any other equipment shall take place within the barriers.**

Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase, in accordance with Policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- 4. All service routes, drain runs, soakaways or excavations in connection with the development hereby permitted shall remain wholly outside the tree protection barriers.**

Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase, in accordance with Policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- 5. The rooflights shown in the northern and southern roof slopes shall be obscure glazed and must be maintained in that condition in perpetuity.**

Reason: To protect the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties, in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- 6. The development hereby approved shall be designed and built to meet Regulation 36 2 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015.**

Reason: In the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
- 7. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the details approved on the 25th July 2018.**

Roof: Michelmersh Antique Red

Walls: Michelmersh Hampshire Stock Dark Multi

Timber cladding: Sadolin Supadec Satin

Joinery: Painted Softwood

Windows: velux conservation black

Rainwater goods: black

Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- 8. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use or occupied until the approved parking provision has been laid out and provided for use in accordance with the approved plan and this space(s) shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy T2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- 9 Notwithstanding the detail submitted in drawing no BH DLP 01 prior to the occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted full details of hard and soft landscape works including planting plans for the entire site shall be provided including written specifications (stating cultivation and other operations associated**

with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities and an implementation programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall also include; proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure, retaining structures and hard surfacing materials (where appropriate). The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme.

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 Policy E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

10. Development shall be provided in accordance with the drainage detail approved on the 25th July 2018:

Building Control Specification Notes V3 July 2018

Drawing no: PTAD/090318/03 - 20.07.2018

Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage provision and the protection of retained trees on site, in accordance with Policies E2 and COM15 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

11. Development shall be provided in accordance with the parking and pathway information approved on the 25th July 2018:

PTAD/090318/03 – 20.07.2018

Reason: To ensure the protection of the retained tree, the listed building and adequate parking provision on site, in accordance with Policies E2, E9 and T2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

Notes to applicant:

1. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. TVBC work with applicants and their agents in a positive and proactive manner offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of issues that may arise in dealing with the application and where possible suggesting solutions.
2. All native reptile species receive legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Protection Act 1981 (as amended). It is highly advisable to undertake clearance of mature garden sites outside the reptile hibernation period (typically October-March). Clearance of garden reptile habitat such as compost heaps, piles of garden waste, general debris and rough vegetation should then take place in a careful and sensitive manner, by hand, to allow any reptiles present to leave the area of their own accord.