
APPLICATION NO.	21/00678/FULLN
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - NORTH
REGISTERED	08.03.2021
APPLICANT	Mr Gregg Allison, Persimmon Homes
SITE	Land At Local Centre, Picket Twenty, Andover, SP11 6LF ANDOVER TOWN (DOWNLANDS)
PROPOSAL	Erection of a block of 18 flats
AMENDMENTS	
CASE OFFICER	Mrs Samantha Owen

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The above application was referred to the 6th January 2022 Northern Area Planning Committee (NAPC) with a recommendation for Permission. The Agenda Report and the Update Paper are appended to this Report. At this meeting Members considered the officer recommendation however concluded that the application should be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development would, due to its large size, prominent siting and relationship with existing buildings, result in an unduly dominant form of development that would be harmful to the character of the area. As such it would conflict with policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Council Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 1.2 The Agenda recommendation for permission was subject to the prior conclusion of a S106 Agreement to secure nutrient neutrality mitigation and affordable housing. The absence of such an agreement should have been considered by members in making their decision. As such the item is brought before members of the Committee to consider adding in two further refusal reasons to reflect the absence of an agreement at the time of decision. Accordingly the officer recommendation has been updated in section 3 below.

2.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 2.1 The Agent has submitted additional information in relation to the concerns of members in relation to the impact of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area. The additional information includes Storey Height Plans a Check Plan that shows building line and landscaping, the original Design Document for P20 and an email of explanation which is set out in its entirety below:

“You will see from the attached that whilst the dwellinghouses are of 2/2.5 storey height in the main, the scale of the buildings within the Local Centre differs considerably. To the north and north-west of the application site, there is an increase in height to be 3 to 4 stories at the apex of the Local Centre. The buildings then reduce in height toward the periphery of the Centre, back to the 2 storey, residential scale of the wider site and along Picket Twenty Way in both directions. Although there are single storey buildings in terms of volume within the Centre, owing to their contemporary design, their actual height is above that what be expected of single storey buildings.

This design approach is deliberate. The aspirations of the Local Centre are set out within the attached Design Code for the original Picket Twenty outline application. In particular, I would draw your attention to page 23 which sets out a building heights strategy for the wider development and proposes taller buildings (defined as 2.5-4 storey) in the selected locations, including the Local Centre.

Within the context of the Design Code, and having regard to the scale of the buildings that currently existing in and around the Local Centre, therefore, it is clear that the proposed block of flats fits neatly into the gap within the streetscene, and appropriately bookends this part of the Local Centre, forming a visual focal point whilst reducing in height in the same manner as on the other side of the Centre.

In terms of building line. I note that it was suggested that the proposed build out to be located at the rear of the site. As can be seen from the attached, that would place the building immediately adjacent to an important retained hedge, in close proximity to existing residential dwellings and would, by necessity, require car parking fronting onto the Local Centre. This would not only present issues from an ecological and residential amenity perspective, it would be in direct conflict with the aims and objectives of the Design Code produced for the outline. The application site was always intended to have a taller building facing onto the Local Centre, and such a building is necessary to complete the built form of the Centre. The attached ‘Check Plan’ shows that the building line and extent of landscaping to the front of the proposed building is entirely in keeping with the adjacent built form.

Moreover, in terms of the design and general appearance of the building itself, it is important to consider that the appearance of the proposed building is directly comparable to the building on the north-western side of the Local Centre. The only differences are that the building is handed and there is a simpler roof form and differing materials being proposed. Rather than mimicking the less than successful grey and yellow palette, it was considered appropriate to reflect the red brick of the nearby Retail Unit and Community Centre buildings, adding to the continuity across the Local Centre.

In view of the above, I submit that a refusal of this application on design grounds is unsustainable and I invite the Members to visit the site within information in hand prior to the next sitting of the Planning Committee.”

3.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the reasons:

- 1. The proposed development would, due to its large size, prominent siting and relationship with existing buildings, result in an unduly dominant form of development that would be harmful to the character of the area. As such it would conflict with policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Council Revised Local Plan 2016.**
 - 2. The proposed development by means of its nature, location and scale could have likely significant harmful effects upon the nearby Solent and Southampton Water European Designated Site which is designated for its conservation importance. In the absence of a completed legal agreement securing the proposed off site mitigation, the applicant has failed to satisfy the Council that the proposal would not adversely affect the special interest of the Solent and Southampton Water European Designated Site. Therefore the application is contrary to policies COM2 and E5 of the adopted Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).**
 - 3. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure an appropriate level of affordable housing within the scheme, the proposal fails to comply with policy COM7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document September 2020.**
-