
APPLICATION NO.	22/01976/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	02.08.2022
APPLICANT	Mr John Durman
SITE	Sunnyside House, Ampfield Hill, Ampfield, SO51 9BD, AMPFIELD
PROPOSAL	Erection of two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, reconfiguration of roof space to create one bedroom
AMENDMENTS	Amended Elevations – additional privacy screening and reduction in window size to rear dormer. Plans re-named to correctly show direction of elevations.
CASE OFFICER	Nathan Glasgow

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)
[Click here to view application](#)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to the Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of the local Ward member, citing the amount of local interest.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 Sunnyside House is a large, detached two-storey dwelling set in the settlement area of Ampfield. It is accessed directly from Ampfield Hill, on its northern side and at its junction with Wingham Lane.

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 Erection of two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, reconfiguration of roof space to create one bedroom.

3.2 The scheme also includes alterations to the front of the dwelling, including a new gable projection at first floor and alterations to the external materials/cladding, fenestration details and a change in design of the existing dormer windows.

3.3 Amended details have been received, setting out an amendment to the fenestration proposed along the rear elevation. This amounts to a reduction in the size of the dormer window serving bedroom 4, with additional privacy screening to this window and the remaining rear windows at first floor level.

4.0 HISTORY

4.1 **22/00932/FULLS** – Erection of a boundary wall, entrance gates and fencing to the perimeter of the property – Permission subject to conditions.

4.2 **21/03532/FULLS** – Demolition of detached garage, erection of detached annexe containing games room and gymnasium – Permission subject to conditions.

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Ecology** – No objection subject to a condition.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 10.11.2022

6.1 **Ampfield Parish Council** – Objection

This application follows 22/000932/FULLS and 21/03532/FULLS which have planning consent. The existing building also has (older) extensions. In deciding our comment, we have considered the cumulative result of all the development. We feel that the perspective drawing of the rear elevation could be misleading:

- The roof windows for the third storey are not shown, so that the design reads as a 2-storey building rather than the three storeys that it really is;
- The size of the neighbouring properties is wrongly shown as larger than the proposed extended Sunnyside, whereas in fact they are smaller;
- And the perspective used makes the open area look longer than the width of the house, where in reality it is approximately square.

6.2 The Site

We consider that the site will be over-developed if the proposal takes place. This is especially so in its rural position on the border of (albeit outside) the Ampfield Conservation Area:

- The extensive proposal presented in this application, together with the work underway have included the removal of all planting on the site including the boundaries. It appears that no space has been provided for boundary planting or other soft landscaping.
- The new proposed alterations are so extensive that the proposed exterior has the appearance of a new building, of a much increased size, bulk, and scale.
- The house will be linked to the annex, forming a single, large building.
- Together with the other buildings and hard landscaping on the site, around half of the site will be built upon.

6.3 Character and appearance

The style and design features of the proposal are different to the original building and any of the properties in the area. All features of the original building are lost in this proposal, which includes re-modelling of the exterior of the building. Furthermore, the proposed design is out of character with the surrounding buildings, which are variously historic cottages (some are listed) and modern buildings in the vernacular style. The Ampfield VDS says

6.4 “Where an existing building is to be extended, the proposed design should complement and respect the style, detail and material of the original, together with the overall appearance of the dwelling in its neighbourhood. There should be no significant detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Development should respect, complement and integrate with the character of the area in which the development is located. Where a development fails to integrate with or respect the character of its neighbourhood, that development should not be permitted.

The roof heights of any new development should respect those of nearby properties in order to provide a harmonious street scene”.

6.5 We note:

- The proposed large and flat-roof dormers with metal verges on the front elevation are contemporary in style and out of keeping with the vernacular features of nearby buildings.
- Equally, the rear elevation does not fit in with the area.
- The site is on a corner, so both front and rear elevations will be visible from public highways.
- The proposal links the main house with the new annex, so the two buildings will become one very large block, exacerbating the sense of scale and bulk.
- In summary, the proposal will be disharmonious in the street scene.

6.6 Neighbouring properties

The proposal results in loss of privacy for the neighbouring properties through the addition of a third storey overlooking their private living and recreation space. This will be particularly extreme for the property at the north, which is a bungalow, and is to be completely overlooked. The garden of the neighbouring 1 The Stables is also to be overlooked. All existing boundary planting of shrubs, hedges and trees, which would have helped to screen the property from the neighbours has already been removed during the work in progress and no space appears to be allowed for replacement.

6.7 Parking and other matters

Parking needs consideration. It is already problematic as several vehicles tend to park on the verges, impeding access for passing pedestrians. It is unclear from the application how many parking spaces have been included for the proposed 5-bedroom house. We assume that SSE, as owners of the electricity substation which is located on the North East side of Sunnyside House have been notified of the application as part of the neighbour consultation. Further, we understand that there are overhead supply cables in close proximity to the proposal.

6.8 Proposed conditions

If the application is recommended for approval, we would make the following observations, based on neighbours' experiences with the work currently being done to implement planning permission 21/03532/FULLS that a construction working hour's condition is imposed.

6.9 Further letters of objection were received and are summarised below.

6.10 **1 The Stables**

- The new annexe building is very overbearing to 1 The Stables and is out of character
- The joining of this to the main house and the new rear extensions would create a building very large for the size of the plot and cause even more loss of privacy
- The swimming pool is built on a high level next to the boundary fence and anyone standing beside the pool can easily look down into our garden.
- No space for plants, shrubs, hedges etc.
- Concern about the lack of parking/parking area too small
- The house will be very large and overbearing; resulting in a loss of light in our garden and overlooking from the second and third floors.
Concern of a balcony/roof terrace
- Drawings are misleading

6.11 **2 The Stables**

- Annexe is much bigger and more intrusive than the plans would have you believe, and being built out of dark brick and black slate cladding and a black slate roof is very overbearing and dominating
- Swimming pools and terraces have been built on raised ground at the rear of the garden, and not shown on the submitted plans/drawings
- No space for planting of hedges to provide screening/privacy
- Documents are factually incorrect and misleading
- Extension is very large and will result in a dwelling that is bigger and out of character with anything nearby and moves the mass further back into the plot
- Parking is still an issue
- No effort to accord with the Ampfield VDS
- Garden will be directly overlooked by 4 full height, full width windows
- Relevant precedent to reject this application (17/01217/RESS)
- Previous permissions despite many objections
- Construction should have been limited for the building of the annexe.
- There are already 2 building projects in progress on this site.
Therefore, no permission should be given for further work until Test Valley can see the standard and positioning of the present building works as to how these have affected the neighbouring area
- Plans do not show the historic additions to the dwelling
- A house like this should be in a much bigger plot and further away from neighbours.

6.12 **3 The Stables**

- Lack of parking and use of verges to park

6.13 **Wingham Barn Cottage**

- Ampfield VDS refers to integrate, respect and complement the character of the area – this proposal has not attempted to comply with this criteria

- The joining of the house with the annex will give the impression of one large building
- Materials are not consistent with the character of the area and will be visibly intrusive in the landscape
- Proposal does not cater for the future parking needs of a property of this size.
- Construction vehicles parking on roadside verges.

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

7.2 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016)(RLP)

COM2: Settlement Hierarchy

E1: High Quality Development in the Borough

E5: Biodiversity

E9: Heritage

LHW4: Amenity

T1: Managing Movement

T2: Parking Standards

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Ampfield Village Design Statement

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on character and appearance of the area
- Impact on ecology
- Impact on heritage assets
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Impact on highway safety and parking provision
- Ampfield Village Design Statement

8.2 Principle of development

The application site is located within the settlement boundary of Ampfield, as defined by the Inset Maps of the Revised Local Plan. Development within the settlement is considered to be acceptable in principle under Policy COM2 of the Revised Local Plan, subject to it being in accordance with other relevant planning policy.

8.3 Impact on character and appearance of the area

Sunnyside House finds itself located in a prominent location within the village of Ampfield. It is sited on the northern side of Ampfield Hill, on the brow of the hill at the junction with Wingham Lane. The existing dwelling is of a post-war construction, and adds little to the street scene in terms of its visual aesthetics.

Directly to the west of the site is The Stables, a small cluster of five new build dwellings, which along with Sunnyside House provides the dominating feature, and character, of the area.

8.4 Ampfield Hill is characterised by the various designs of dwellings that are seen on both sides of the road. The proposed scheme would provide a more contemporaneous design that would incorporate a new first floor gable projection, a redesigning/modernising of the existing dormer windows and alterations to the fenestration. The materials to be used include new slate roof tiles, white render and grey facing brickwork, similar to those used on other recent development on the site, that of the adjacent outbuilding and the boundary gates and fencing.

8.5 Ampfield Hill

When considering the proposed scheme in relation to the existing street scene of Ampfield Hill, there is not considered to be any harm apportioned to the character of the area. The dwelling will remain in proportion to its neighbour, 1 The Stables, while the use of white render at the first floor level will also complement and integrate with 1 The Stables. The alterations that would be visible from Ampfield Hill would not be incongruous or dominant within the character of the area by virtue of its scale and the external appearance of the scheme.

8.6 Winghams Lane

Winghams Lane is a public right of way (Ampfield 12), and serves a small number of dwellings to the north of the application site, while providing general access to the fields north before it converges within Ampfield Wood. Despite the rear extensions being at two storey in height and scale, views from this public right of way would be extremely limited. The case officer traversed this footpath in December, and it was evident that longer distance views were screened by the extensive verdant features along the lane, while closer views were screened by the existing outbuilding that bounds Winghams Lane. Notwithstanding this, any glimpsed views of the extensions would be seen in the context of the existing dwelling. The scheme is considered to be of a high quality that respects the character of the area and is in accordance with Policy E1 of the Revised Local Plan.

8.7 Impact on biodiversity

The development will affect bats, although the submitted survey work and proposed mitigation is considered to be acceptable. Bats receive protection under UK law via the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under EU law by the Habitats Directive, which is transposed into UK law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Where development affects European Protected Species' (EPS), permission can be granted unless the development is likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive underpinning the Habitats Regulations, and is unlikely to be granted an EPS licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law. Licenses will not normally be granted in the absence of planning permission.

8.8 *Is the development likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive?*

The application is supported by a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (Dr. Jonty Denton, November 2021), a Phase 2 Bat Survey Report (Dr. Jonty Denton, June 2022 and a Bat Mitigation Strategy (The Ecology Partnership, October 2022). The development will affect bats, although the survey work and proposed mitigation are considered to be acceptable, as set out by the Council's Ecologist.

8.9 The existing house was found to present numerous features that have the potential to support bats, and evidence of a serotine roost was recorded. Further Phase 2 presence/absence surveys have confirmed the presence of a low status common pipistrelle roost and an updating roof void inspection has confirmed that in addition to the serotine roost, the roof void also supports a brown long-eared bat day roost a brown long-eared bat was recorded in the void and DNA analysis has confirmed the serotine roost. The development will result in the loss of roosts used by individual non-breeding bats. If avoidance measures are not taken then the work has the potential to injure/kill individual bats, and the development will therefore result in a breach of the EU Directive.

8.10 *Is the development unlikely to be licensed?*

An EPS licence can only be granted if the development proposal is able to meet three tests, as assessed below.

8.11 *1. The consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))*

The existing building is a private dwelling in reasonable condition. Proposals involving development, such as a replacement dwelling, extensions and outbuildings are considered to contribute to the wider public interest by providing continued modern standard housing and employment. The local conservation status of the roosts in the property would require the considerations of the tests to be proportionate. In this regard, it is considered that the first derogation test is met by the proposal as the public interest is sufficient to balance the low impact on the protected species.

8.12 *2. There must be 'no satisfactory alternative'; (Regulation 53(9)(a))*

There are a number of alternatives available to the applicant, including a do-nothing option. However, it is reasonable to expect the applicant to undertake improvements and alterations to their home as their needs change. Without allowing for this, it is likely that an alternative property would be required and even then, subsequent owners may also wish to make improvements or alterations to the dwelling. Any alterations to the dwelling, whether or not they require planning permission, would potentially impact the bat roost. As a result, it is considered that there are no satisfactory alternatives to the proposed development, and the second test is met.

8.13 3. The action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range'; (Regulation 53(9)(b))

A detailed strategy is provided that includes methods to be followed during the development to ensure bats are not disturbed, injured or killed, together with new roosting opportunities to be provided within the retained sections of the roof void and on the extended building. These measures are supported by the Council's Ecologist and the development is not unlikely to be licenced. Subject to development proceeding in accordance with the submitted ecology survey, the scheme would accord with Policy E5 of the Revised Local Plan.

8.14 Impact on heritage assets

As described above, the application is adjacent the Ampfield Conservation Area, which runs along the eastern boundary along Wingham Lane. Furthermore, the dwelling to the east, Hillside Cottages, are Grade II listed.

8.15 Ampfield Conservation Area

Despite the proximity to the Conservation Area, the relationship between the extensions and the conservation area are considered to be limited. The front alterations are of a size and scale that would not dominate public views from and into the conservation area, while the modernisation of this front and side elevation are considered to improve the visual aesthetics of the site. In addition to this, the dwelling is separated from the conservation area by the adjacent outbuilding. The impact upon the conservation area is considered to be neutral.

8.16 Hillside Cottages

This pair of cottages are Grade II listed and sited immediately opposite the application site, across Wingham Lane. The cottages are themselves screened from Wingham Lane by extensive foliage and there is a clear visual contrast that can be noted across the two dwellings straddling Wingham Lane. However, and similar to above, the separation between the properties and the screening provided by the adjacent outbuilding, there is not considered to be any harm to the setting of the listed building. The scheme is considered to accord with Policy E9 of the Revised Local Plan and Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

8.17 Impact on neighbouring amenity

The application site is bounded by neighbouring properties directly to the west (1 The Stables), north (2 The Stables), across Wingham Lane from Hillside Cottages and to the south and across Ampfield Hill are a number of detached properties.

8.18 1 The Stables

1 The Stables is a two storey detached dwelling located directly west of the application site. The rear elevation of this property is set back further than the ground floor of the proposed scheme, as can be seen upon the block plan while the first floor extensions would remain behind the rear elevation of 1 The Stables. Furthermore, no side windows are proposed. The amended plans have sought to reduce the size of the dormer window in proximity to the

mutual boundary, reducing the impact of potential overlooking, while additional privacy screening has been added to this dormer window and the two other windows on the rear elevation. The mutual overlooking that may result from this extension is not likely to be any worse than that likely currently exists (a dormer window exists in this location) between the two dwellings.

8.19 2 The Stables

To the rear of the application site is 2 The Stables, a two storey dwelling which includes rooms in the roof and a subterranean “ground” floor. This property is orientated on a 90° angle from Sunnyside House, with its front elevation to the west and its side elevation to the south, towards the application site. Upon visiting this property, it was apparent that the only side (south) elevation window was to the lounge, which was dual aspect. However, much of this window was screened by the existing boundary fence and it is not considered that the development would result in any significant loss of light or overlooking to this habitable space. The additional screening that has been proposed further reduces the impact upon the neighbouring property, 2 The Stables.

8.20 In terms of the garden area to the rear, again this was separated by the boundary fence, with four trees planted along the boundary, on the neighbour’s side, providing necessary screening from the application site. It is not considered that the occupants of 2 The Stables would be subject to a loss of light or privacy to unacceptable levels.

8.21 Hillside Cottages

The proposed extensions would have no significant adverse impact upon the occupants of Hillside Cottages, due to the separation across Wingham Lane and the intervening features such as the outbuilding at the application site and verdant boundary features.

8.22 Dwellings on Ampfield Hill

The dwellings to the south of the application site are considered to be at a distance whereby the proposal would result in any significant adverse impact with regards to overlooking and loss of light. The scheme is considered to accord with Policy LHW4 of the Revised Local Plan.

8.23 Impact on highway safety and parking provision

The gates and boundary fencing that have been partly constructed are subject to a previous planning permission, where there was not considered to be any harm upon the highway network and its users. In addition to this, upon the case officer’s site visit, three large vehicles were comfortably parked within the driveway area of the application site, which meets the minimum threshold for a dwelling of this size. The scheme is considered to accord with policies T1 and T2 of the Revised Local Plan.

8.24 Ampfield Village Design Statement (VDS)

The Ampfield VDS contains guidelines which are similar to those as set out in the local plan. Relevant to this application are the following.

- 8.25 Does the development maintain existing spaces between buildings?
The extensions would be located to the rear and not to the side – yes, the development will maintain existing spaces between buildings.
- 8.26 Does the development complement, respect and enhance the environment of the heritage assets?
As assessed above in paragraphs 8.14 – 8.16, the scheme would not result in harm to the heritage assets of the Ampfield Conservation Area or of Hillside Cottages. The scheme is at a distance where the two buildings are not read in the same context, and due to the siting outside of the conservation area and minimal alterations externally, it is considered that the development does respect the environment of the heritage assets.
- 8.27 Does the development respect, complement and integrate with the character of the area?
This guidelines are based on Policy E1 of the Local Plan – as assessed above in paragraphs 8.3 – 8.6, the scheme is considered to respect, complement and integrate with the character of the area.
- 8.28 Is the development in-keeping with the neighbourhood?
As assessed above, the size and scale of the dwelling is commensurate with its nearest neighbour (1 The Stables) and utilises white render that also matches this property (and the existing Sunnyside House). The size of the plot is extremely generous (879m²) when compared to its neighbours (the next largest, 2 The Stables, at 555m²). Upon visiting the site, it was apparent that there was ample garden space available to the occupants of Sunnyside House, despite the two large buildings (dwelling and outbuilding) that exist. In terms of the plot size, the proposed development would not result in a building that is not proportional to its plot.
- 8.29 Is there a measure of variety proposed?
Yes, while the scheme has taken cues from neighbouring properties (render at 1 The Stables) and the modern design used on the existing outbuilding, this contemporaneous design is considered to ‘avoid sterile uniformity’ within the street scene, as set out in the VDS.
- 8.30 Does the proposal complement and respect the style, detail and material of the original?
Despite appearing at odds with the above guidance, it can be demonstrated that the materials used are similar to those which are used on the existing dwelling, which is a fully rendered dwelling. Furthermore, the design mimics the design of the outbuilding, which is a material consideration into the consideration of this scheme.
- 8.31 Is off-street parking available?
Yes, adequate off-street parking is available.

8.32 Other matters

Objections were received from the Parish Council and local residents and these are assessed below. Comments relating to the construction/design of the existing outbuilding are not material considerations of this planning application. Neither are the comments which refer to the swimming pool which has been constructed. Furthermore, some of the commentary relates to the assessments already carried out above and the following are the relevant comments/objections that have not been covered in the above report.

8.33 Cumulative development

There is no policy that states that having previous planning permission should limit the ability to extend a property further. Each application is determined on their own merits and as assessed above, the site/plot can comfortably accommodate the extension as proposed.

8.34 Perspective drawings

The perspective drawings are not scaled drawings that make up and form the consideration of the application. They are for illustrative purposes only.

8.35 Removal of all planting on the site boundaries

There is no requirement for additional/replacement planting to be provided in this application, particularly in the rear garden. However, the previous permission (22/00932/FULLS) included the provision of planting behind the new boundary treatment along the south and east. It should also be noted that the adjacent Wingham Lane/Hillside Cottages contain verdant features within the street scene.

8.36 Link to the outbuilding

It has been suggested that the link proposed would result in a single (and larger) dwelling. The link would be glazed and have a very minimal visual impact. The link would be seen as what it is, a link between two separate buildings.

8.37 Half of the site would be built on and should built away from neighbours

The plot size and accommodation of the extension has been assessed above. It may be that the objector is confusing the General Permitted Development Order in terms of not building on more than 50% of a site. It is not known how a householder can "build away from neighbours".

8.38 Differing styles to existing dwelling and neighbouring/Ampfield VDS

As set out in the Ampfield VDS, it is acceptable for dwellings to not result in a sterile uniformity, and good, high quality design should hold considerable weight in the planning balance.

8.39 House will be overbearing and result in a loss of light and overlooking

Loss of privacy and amenity have been assessed above. In terms of the dwelling being overbearing, the dormer window to bedroom 4 (closest to 1 The Stables) is in the same position as exists and the amended plans provide additional screening (following a reduction in the size of the window). The rear windows are large but serve an en-suite/dressing room and a bedroom and

again, have been providing with screening to limit any potential perceived overlooking. However, they are considered to be at an appropriate distance from neighbouring properties where overlooking and a loss of privacy is not considered to impact the neighbouring residents.

8.40 *Documents are factually incorrect and misleading*

The application has been deemed as being valid and the Case Officer has assessed the documentation and carried out a thorough site visit. The recommendation has considered all relevant matters.

8.41 *Parking is still an issue/would not cater for future parking needs*

There is not considered to be an issue of parking. The site can comfortably accommodate three vehicles, as was shown on the Case Officer's site visit. It is understood that locals are frustrated with vehicles parking outside of the application site and on the grass verge, but this lies outside of the site boundary and the Council have no control over the use of this area for parking. The property already meets the threshold for parking as set out in the Local Plan; any additional extension would not require further parking provision, although would have to be considered under any potential planning application.

8.42 *Relevant precedent to reject this application (17/01217/RESS)*

There is no such thing as a precedent in planning. Notwithstanding this, it is not known how these applications relate. 17/01217/RESS was a Reserved Matters application for the details following the approval of 16/01241/OUTS, a scheme of four dwellings, and not householder extensions.

8.43 *Previous permissions granted despite attracting objections*

Objections do not automatically result in a refusal for planning applications. Planning applications are determined on their individual merits and relevant planning considerations, which include the input from members of the public.

8.44 *Planning permission should not be given until TVBC can see the standard and positioning of the annexe*

As above, the annexe is not included within this application and has been granted planning permission. Furthermore, there is no function or ability for the Council to simply defer making a decision for reasons such as determining the build quality of other buildings.

8.45 *Plans do not show the historic additions to the dwelling*

This is not set out as a local or national requirement for the validation of planning applications; the plans only need to show the existing dwelling and what is proposed.

8.46 *Construction vehicles*

A condition has been recommended requiring details of vehicle movements/parking during the construction period. However, as above, the Council has no power on restricting the use of public highway for the parking of taxed and road legal vehicles.

8.47 The roof windows for the third storey are not shown

It is assumed that this refers to the perspective images within the design and access statement. As above, these are perspective images, not the scaled drawings upon which are assessed. The roof window is clearly shown on the submitted plans.

8.48 The size of the neighbouring properties are wrongly shown

Again, this must be referring to the perspective images. The submitted plans are scaled and are considered to represent reality.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The application is not considered to result in any significant adverse impact with regards to overlooking or a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, and would not be detrimental to the highway safety or ecology. Furthermore, the scheme is considered to be of a high quality that improves the aesthetics of the street scene. The scheme is therefore considered to accord with the policies of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) and the Ampfield Village Design Statement.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

PERMISSION subject to:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years from the date of this permission.**
Reason: To comply with the provision of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans/numbers:**
Location Plan - P1069-A-PLN-100
Proposed Ground/First Floor - P1069-A-PLN-210
Proposed Second Floor/Roof - P1069-A-PLN-211-A
Proposed North/East Elevations - P1069-A-PLN-310-A
Proposed South/West Elevations - P1069-A-PLN-311-A
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. **The external materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those as listed within the approved plans, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship of the new development with the existing in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.
4. **Development shall proceed in accordance with the measures set out in the Bat Mitigation Strategy (The Ecology Partnership, October 2022) unless varied by a European Protected Species (EPS) license issued by Natural England. Thereafter, mitigation and enhancement features shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: To ensure the favourable conservation status of bats in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 5. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until provision for the manoeuvring, loading and unloading of vehicles and the parking of construction related vehicles has been made in accordance with the approved plans, including any surfacing and marking out. The areas of land so provided shall be retained at all times for these purposes.**

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

- 6. No work relating to the construction of the development hereby approved, including deliveries, collections or works of demolition or preparation prior to operations, shall take place before the hours of 07.30 nor after 18.00 on Mondays to Fridays; before the hours of 08.00 nor after 13.00 on Saturdays; and at all on Sundays and Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed with the LPA.**

Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

Note to applicant:

- 1. 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.**
-