
APPLICATION NO.	23/02385/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	14.09.2023
APPLICANT	Senior Living (Chandler's Ford) Ltd
SITE	Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road, SO52 9BH, AMPFIELD
PROPOSAL	Development to form Phases 2 & 3 of care village (Use Class C2), comprising erection of buildings to provide 91 no. 1 and 2-bedroom extra care apartments, provision of outdoor amenity space, landscaping, parking provision and associated works
AMENDMENTS	Received on 13.02.2024: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amended Site Layout, amended plans and elevations (Blocks 5, 13 and 14).
CASE OFFICER	Graham Melton

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

[Click here to view application](#)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of members.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 The wider application site comprises an open parcel of land measuring approximately 4.05ha in total, located on the north-west side of Baddesley Road. The application site benefits from a previous outline planning permission to be redeveloped for care accommodation (application reference 17/01615/OUTS, paragraph 4.8).

2.2 The current proposal relates to an area measuring approximately 2.75ha, located adjacent to the eastern boundaries with Monks Brook and Flexford Close and also includes the section of the application site bordering Baddesley Road and Wheelhouse Park to the south and east.

2.3 The residual land within the centre of the application site is the location of the recently approved Village Centre building and three storey block of accommodation which is currently under construction (application reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.5).

2.4 Previously the application site was in use for industrial and storage purposes as defined by the lawful development certificate issued under application reference 16/01889/CLES, paragraph 4.11.

3.0 **PROPOSAL**

3.1 The proposal is for the erection of a series of detached buildings to serve as care home accommodation, with the precise schedule of accommodation as follows:

Block Number	Number of storeys	Amount and Type of Accommodation
Block 1	2	2 x 2 bed
Block 2	2	4 x 2 bed
Block 3	2	7 x 2 bed
Block 4	2	2 x 1 bed 4 x 2 bed
Block 5	3	10 x 2 bed
Block 6	2	6 x 2 bed
Block 6A	2	2 x 2 bed
Block 7	2	4 x 2 bed
Block 8	2	8 x 2 bed
Block 9	2	4 x 2 bed
Block 11	2	4 x 2 bed
Block 12	2	4 x 2 bed
Block 13	2	1 x 2 bed
Block 14	2	7 x 2 bed
Block 14A	2	2 x 2 bed
Block 17	3	8 x 2 bed
Block 19	3	12 x 2 bed
Total		91 units - 2 x 1 bed units 89 x 2 bed units

3.2 The current proposal follows the refusal of previous application reference (21/02697/RESS, paragraph 4.1), with a revised layout seeking to overcome the harm that formed the basis of the first reason of refusal, namely an overbearing impact on neighbouring property from the proposed buildings annotated as Blocks 7 and 9 on the submitted plans. A detailed comparison between the two schemes for these particular blocks is set out in paragraphs 8.14 to 8.17 (Block 7) and 8.19 to 8.21 (Block 9) below.

4.0 **RELEVANT HISTORY**

4.1 **21/02697/RESS** - Approval of details for appearance, landscaping, and layout of a care village pursuant to outline planning permission 17/01615/OUTS.

Application refused for the following reasons (subsequent to Southern Area Planning Committee meeting on 25.04.23, decision issued on 02.05.2023):

- 01. The proposed development, and specifically Blocks 7 and 9, would by virtue of the overall building height at those points (resulting from the combination of the physical structures themselves and the positioning on higher ground level relative to the original ground level) would lead to a feeling of overbearing giving rise to an adverse and detrimental effect on the living conditions of neighbouring properties at No.'s 21 and 55*

Flexford Close. In this respect the proposal would be to the detriment of those residents contrary to Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

02. The proposed development by means of its nature, location and scale could have likely significant effects upon the nearby Solent and Southampton Water European Designated Site which is designated for its conservation importance. In the absence of information relating to the development achieving nutrient neutrality or onsite/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).

03. The proposed development by means of its nature, location and scale could have likely significant effects upon the nearby Solent and Southampton Water European Designated Site which is designated for its conservation importance. In the absence of information relating to the development achieving phosphate neutrality or onsite/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).

Case Officer note: An appeal against this refusal decision has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and is currently pending consideration. The appeal reference number is APP/C1760/W/23/3328784.

- 4.2 **21/02555/FULLS** – Change of use of the land to accommodate the erection of a marketing suite in connection with the redevelopment of the site to provide a care village under permission ref. 17/01615/OUTS, including associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping, for a temporary period of 3 years. *Temporary permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 10.03.2022.*
- 4.3 **20/02916/FULLS** – Construction of new access road and junction, including repositioning of existing bus stop, erection of entrance feature wall, associated landscaping, lighting and stopping up of existing access. *Permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 30.03.2021.*
- 4.4 **20/02080/ADVS** - Display of hoarding advertisement and 2 x flagpole advertisements during construction period. *Consent subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 19.10.2020.*

- 4.5 **20/00488/RESS** – Approval of details for appearance, landscaping, and layout of pursuant of a care village pursuant to outline planning permission 17/01615/OUTS. *Approval subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 23.12.2020.*
- 4.6 **19/00616/FULLS** - Erection of a storage/office building for Wheelhouse Park with associated parking, landscaping and access. *Permission subject to conditions and notes, decision issued on 30.05.2019.*
- 4.7 **19/00471/RESS** - Details of Layout, Appearance and Landscaping for the part of the site which is intended to be developed for the provision of a storage/office building for Wheelhouse Park only. *Application withdrawn on 26.03.2019.*
- 4.8 **17/01615/OUTS** - Outline application for demolition of existing industrial buildings and re-development to form a Care Village (Use Class C2), comprising 2-3 storey care home building/community hub containing up to either 65 no. care beds or up to 48 no. "extra care" units and core facilities: a series of 2-2.5 storey buildings containing up to 101 no.1 and 2 bedroom "extra care" units; single vehicular access from Baddesley Road (including retained access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park); associated car and cycle parking spaces; provision of associated outdoor amenity space; provision of semi-natural "ecological" buffer zone and grassland; proposed new landscaping/tree planting; provision of on-site drainage; and undergrounding of existing overhead electricity lines. New barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park (Class B8/B1 - "sui generis"). *Outline permission, decision issued on 27.09.2018.*
- 4.9 **17/00616/OUTS** - Outline application for a Care Village following demolition of existing industrial buildings comprising 65 no. bed, 2-3 storey care home (Class C2); 87 no. 'extra care' units (Class C2); community building (up to 280 sq. m. GFA) (Class D1); 16 no. 'age restricted retirement dormer bungalows' (Class C3); new convenience store (up to 280 sq. m. GFA) (Class A1); new barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park (100-120 sq. m. GFA) (Class B8/B1 - 'sui generis'); with single vehicular access from Baddesley Road (including retained access to North Hill Cottage and Wheelhouse Park); new pedestrian access from Baddesley Road to convenience store; associated car and cycle parking spaces; provision of associated outdoor amenity space; provision of semi-natural 'ecological' buffer zone and grassland; proposed new landscaping/tree planting; provision of on-site drainage; and undergrounding of existing overhead electricity lines. *Application withdrawn on 15.05.2017.*
- 4.10 **17/00637/SCRS** - Screening Opinion under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 - Demolition of existing industrial buildings and redevelopment of site to provide 'Care Village' including new convenience store, car and cycle parking provision, outdoor amenity space and new barn store/offices for Wheelhouse Park. *Environmental Impact Assessment not required, decision issued on 05.04.2017.*

4.11 **16/01889/CLES** - Mixed use of the land and existing buildings for general industrial (with ancillary offices) (Class B2); light industrial (Class B1 (c)); storage and distribution (Class B8) together with the use for the parking of commercial vehicles and caravans along with the use for the purposes of a water pumping - station. *Certificate issued on 02.11.2016.*

5.0 **CONSULTATIONS**

5.1 **Eastleigh Borough Council** – Comment (summarised).

Highways

- The Council has concerns in respect of the likely traffic generation and associated highway impacts within this area as a result of the proposed increased capacity of the care facility.
- This is particularly in respect of the possible extra traffic travelling through North Millers Dale, as well as along Baddesley Road to the traffic lights with Hursley Road/Hiltingbury Road and along Winchester and Bournemouth Roads to the M3.

Water Management

- Concerns are raised in respect of water quality and flows of the stream that runs along the north-eastern side of the site.
- Appropriate mitigation should be in place for both the construction and operation periods to ensure that the proposal does not result in a detrimental impact on the wider river network.

Impact on the general amenity of the area

- Concerns are also raised in respect of potential sewage capacity, which could affect the local area.
- If approved, it is essential that any mitigation includes infrastructure projects and/or their funding within the Eastleigh Borough area.

5.2 **Ecology** – No objection subject to conditions.

5.3 **Environment Agency** – No objection.

5.4 **Highways** – No objection subject to securing of Travel Plan.

5.5 **Landscape** – Comment (summarised).

- The proposals are very similar to that of the previous application 21/02697/RESS with minor amendments.
- It is noted that blocks 7 and 9 have been redesigned and moved west, away from Monks Brook, allowing more space for better quality landscaping and reducing the impact of the proposals from Flexford Close.
- Having considered the proposed tree and shrubs species for Monks Brook, there is range of native species proposed with the only species to be evergreen being Holly and Yew; from a landscape perspective the proposed species are an appropriate choice and considered acceptable.

- Whilst this may be the case, it will leave the site open in winter months, even when fully established.
- The photomontages show the views from the neighbouring development; however, these are all in summer months, due to the deciduous nature of the proposed planting, the development would be substantially more prominent in winter months.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that blocks 7 and 9 have been moved back the proposals would still be prominent, particularly in winter months.
- The wall along the frontage is shown to have writing advertising the development, as previously stated on numerous responses for this site, the frontage was supposed to remain green and natural.
- It was agreed that a wall could be implemented on condition that it was planted up in front of this to retain the green and natural character, should this writing be accepted, there would be no space for the soft landscaping vegetation.
- Every application submitted is gradually removing the green character we have previously worked so hard to retain.
- Writing to be removed and ornamental planting to be replaced with appropriate hedgerow planting.
- A landscape strategy has been submitted as part of the application, which provides a good indicative layout and demonstrates how the site would integrate within its immediate setting.
- However, a detailed hard and soft landscaping plan is required to be submitted by condition.
- In conjunction with this a detailed landscape management plan is required, this should be for the ongoing establishment and maintenance of the site.
- The landscaping should be implemented where possible in the first available planting season once permission has been granted.

5.6 **Lead Local Flood Authority** – No objection subject to condition.

5.7 **Natural England** – Comment (summarised).

- Further information required to determine impact on designated sites.
- Following information is required:
 - Consideration of this project's effects on total nitrogen and total phosphorus nutrient loading within the Solent catchment and River Itchen, including an additional nutrient budget calculation.
 - Details of proposed mitigation measures to address any nutrient impacts, including appropriately funded management and monitoring, and details of how the measures will be secured for the lifetime of the development.
 - Consideration of recreational impacts on the New Forest designated sites with detail of suitable mitigation proposals as necessary.
- The above information should form an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

Case officer note: The requirement to undertake an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) forms part of the officer recommendation as set out in sections 9 and 10 below.

5.8 **TVBC Environmental Services (Refuse)** – No objection.

5.9 **Trees** – No objection subject to conditions.

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 31.10.2023

6.1 **Ampfield Parish Council** – Objection (summarised).

- Eight residents of Flexford Close made representations at our meeting of 16th October, on behalf of themselves and their neighbours.
- Ampfield Parish Council supports this proposed development in principle, however, a number of problems with the previous planning application which led to a refusal have not been addressed within the current application.

Impact on the amenity of residential property

- At no stage in the history of the series of applications associated with this development has there been an opportunity for anyone to comment on the change in level on the site, which has a detrimental affect on the residents of Flexford Close.
- It has been presented as a fait accompli.
- The land has been raised from approximately the same height each side of the brook, to a whole storey-height higher on the site of Ampfield Meadows.
- This amplifies the problems of scale and privacy that have been identified with all of the blocks proposed to be build adjacent to Flexford Close.
- Being an entirely new application, replacing the application for outline consent, the applicant had the opportunity to completely reconfigure the proposal to reduce levels and improve the topography of the site in proximity of Flexford Close, so as to have less of an impact on those residents.
- However, the proposed changes are limited to blocks 7 and 9.
- Due to the height and scale of proposed blocks 7 and 9, and their position on elevated ground, they are overbearing and affect the privacy and amenity of the existing neighbouring dwellings.
- The ground level, having been artificially increased by the equivalent to one-storey in height could be reduced.
- Alternatively, the blocks could be reduced by a storey.
- The blocks have been amended slightly and moved further from the boundary than they were proposed in the previous application, but this does not make a significant improvement to the lines of sight from Flexford Close.
- The position, height and scale of block 13 is overbearing and will have a detrimental affect on the existing residents of Flexford Close in terms of loss of privacy and amenity. It is unamended from the previous application.

- Opportunities to increase the scale of other blocks on the site, located further from Flexford Close, have not been taken (for example blocks 3 and 5).
- These blocks could have been increased in height in order to balance any units lost from the blocks adjacent to Flexford Close, and enable a satisfactory reduction in height of those blocks.

6.2 **13 letters from local residents** – Objection (summarised).

Planning History

- Previous planning decisions, National Planning Policy Framework, Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- The amendments undertaken are largely cosmetic and do not overcome the concerns which formed the basis of the reasons for refusal of the previous application.
- Previously, Planning Committee members were astonished by the imagined impact of the proposed buildings when view from the perspective of Flexford Close.
- Challenge the basic premise that height does not form part of the parameters and the concept that the developers can build as high as they wish and as close as they wish to neighbouring properties.

Impact on the amenity of neighbouring property

- Overlooking, scale and bulk result in loss of light.
- Submitted section drawings show proposal is unchanged from previous application, leaving only a 20m gap to neighbouring houses.
- Object to raising of ground levels by 4 metres adjacent to Flexford Close, proposed to new ground levels are totally unacceptable.
- The development is too close and too tall in relation to Flexford Close.
- Amendments undertaken are modest and do not overcome the overbearing impact on properties in Flexford Close.
- Following removal of trees, proposal will have a very major loss on all aspects of privacy, natural light resulting in an overbearing impact.
- Headlights from cars will shine into resident's gardens due to elevated ground levels.
- The applicant should revert to the very original plans when the ground levels and heights were not an issue.
- New residents will not wish to look down on the roofs of the properties within Flexford Close.
- The positioning of Blocks 6, 6A and 7 have been moved slightly away from the boundary with Monks Brook which is appreciated but they now have the effect of presenting a high brick wall approximately 60m long, 10m high on top of the 2m uplift in ground level.
- Previously request for Block 6A to be relocated has not been undertaken.
- Submitted section drawings show overlooking of the back of gardens around number 75 Flexford Close.

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

- Design, character of the area, overdevelopment, materials.
- The raising of the ground levels 2.5m above the level indicated on the original application, with the datum of the proposed buildings level with or above the soffits of the nearest Flexford Close properties.
- The determination of the levels is flawed and the result is a massively overbearing building profile that does not comply with Policy E1 or sound planning practice.
- Loss of skyline.
- Scale of the proposed buildings does not comply with Policy E1.
- The construction of the previously approved phase 1 development demonstrates the massive overbearing impact the proposal will have.
- Bungalows are eminently suited to older residents and will have less of an impact on the residents in Flexford Close.
- Trees.
- Main concern is the removal of trees adjacent to 73 Flexford Close which form a protective barrier with the brook and there is no reason to remove them.
- Retaining as many as possible of the existing trees would help screen the whole development from Flexford Close and help the environment.
- The proposed tree plantings will take many years to mature and the proposed deciduous trees will leave the site even more exposed in autumn and winter.
- Any replacement tree planting should be on top of the level ground and not within the existing embankment, so they provide more immediate screening.
- Lack of available space for replacement planting
- Proposed replacement planting should be evergreen to ensure a continuous buffer/screen.
- Drawings are misleading with respect to Beechwood Pumping station by showing mature vegetation that has been removed.

Ecology

- The overall plan to destroy the natural corridor is not in accordance with the Council's environmental policy.
- Proposals contrary to previous concerns raised by Natural England, insufficient measures to meet Habitats Regulations requirements.

Water management

- Adverse impact on existing drainage infrastructure around Monks Brook.
- Calculations should account for extreme weather events currently being experienced.

Impact on the general amenity of the area

- Ground levels have been raised to cap existing tipped waste material.
- Disturbance resulting from the proposed removal of trees along the Monks Brook corridor prior to construction work commencing resulting in dust and dirt falling in garden areas.

- Noise.
- Increased traffic pollution.

Highways

- Traffic generation, parking and safety.

Other matters

Enforcement

- Disappointed that enforcement action against ground levels has not been undertaken despite contact with planning service.

Planning Officer site visits

- Request the officer visit Flexford Close and view the previously approved development from residents' perspective.
- Planning officer has not visited 73 Flexford Close and therefore cannot assess impact of proposals on this particular property.

Property values

- Proposal will devalue neighbouring property.

Democratic rights

- Proposal does not respect the rights of the Flexford residents in anyway and are an affront to the resident's democratic rights.

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) (TVBRLP)

Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy COM2: Settlement Hierarchy

Policy E1: High Quality Development in the Borough

Policy E2: Protect, Conserve and Enhance the Landscape Character of the Borough

Policy E3: Local Gaps

Policy E5: Biodiversity

Policy E7: Water Management

Policy E8: Pollution

Policy LHW4: Amenity

Policy T1: Managing Movement

Policy T2: Parking Standards

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Ampfield Village Design Statement (2019)

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the amenity of residential property

- Impact on the character and appearance of the area
- Ecology
- Water Management
- Impact on the general amenity of the area
- Highways
- Other matters

8.2 Principle of development

Planning History

As outlined in the sections 3 and 4 above the current proposal follows on from a series of recent planning applications. Of particular significance is the issuing of a lawful development certificate under application reference 16/01889/CLES (paragraph 4.11), certifying the previous use of the wider application site for a range of industrial and storage uses.

- 8.3 Subsequent to the issuing of a lawful development certificate application, outline planning permission was granted for the development of the application site for care accommodation (application reference 17/01615/OUTS, paragraph 4.8). In concluding this type of development was acceptable for the application site, the case officer report identified sufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate a need for care accommodation within the Borough and the delivery of significant benefits of an economic and social nature. As such, it was concluded in this instance the proposed redevelopment for care accommodation was essential and in accordance with criterion (b) of Policy COM2. Following a positive resolution at the Planning Committee meetings on the 15th May and 25th September 2018, planning permission was subsequently issued on the 27th September 2018.
- 8.4 Pursuant to the issuing of this outline planning permission, details in relation to layout, appearance and landscaping were submitted as two separate reserved matters applications. Application reference 20/00488/RESS (paragraph 4.5) covered the main village centre building and a separate block of accommodation located in the centre of the application site, receiving approval under delegated powers. This development is currently under construction and nearing completion.
- 8.5 Application reference 21/02697/RESS (paragraph 4.1) set out details of the remaining satellite blocks of accommodation and was subsequently refused, following the resolution of the Planning Committee meeting on the 25th April 2023. The basis for refusing the application was limited to the potential impact of Blocks 7 and 9 on the adjacent properties in Flexford Close (reason no. 1) in addition to the absence of a completed legal agreement securing the required nitrate and phosphate mitigation (reasons no. 2 and 3). The principle of redeveloping the application site for care accommodation did not form the basis of a reason for refusal.

8.6 Current Proposal

The current proposal has been submitted as a standalone planning application, due to the expiry of the deadline for the submission of reserved matters under the original outline permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8). However, in combination with the development permitted under application reference 21/02697/RESS (paragraph 4.1), the current proposal is limited to the scope of care accommodation granted outline permission under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8). As a result, it is considered the previous conclusion with respect to the need for this type of care accommodation, in addition to the associated economic and social benefits arising from the redevelopment of the wider application site, remains valid. This is further demonstrated by the inclusion of the application site within the current 5-year housing land supply position.

8.7 Conclusion on the principle of development

It is considered the need for the type of care accommodation proposed is essential in this instance, given the proposal will in combination with the development previously approved under application reference 21/02697/RESS (paragraph 4.5), deliver the redevelopment scheme subject to the outline planning permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8). As a result, the proposal complies with criterion (b) of Policy COM2 and the principle of development is acceptable when assessed against the development framework of the TVBRLP.

8.8 **Impact on the amenity of residential property**

As the current proposal has been submitted as a standalone planning application rather a reserved matters application pursuant to the original outline permission, then the previous parameters plan is no longer applicable. However, with the exception of Blocks 5 and 17 which are three storey instead of two storey, the current proposal does comply with the previous parameters on storey heights and minimum separation distances to neighbouring properties. With respect to Blocks 5 and 17, these are not located directly adjacent to either the boundary with Flexford Close or Wheelhouse Park and therefore are not positioned direct adjacent to neighbouring property.

8.9 Boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close (Blocks 6, 6A, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13)

The north-east boundary of the application site comprises Monks Brook and the residential properties served by Flexford Close. Due to the ground levels, Monks Brook and the Flexford Close properties are topographically lower than the application site. This difference in ground level becomes more pronounced when travelling further infield towards the rear boundary (north-west) of the application site which adjoins Trodds Copse.

8.10 In comparison to the original ground levels of the application site as indicated by the site survey drawing that accompanied the outline permission, the submitted drawings demonstrate that the proposed ground levels will typically be approximately 2m/2.5m higher at the northern end of the Monks Brook boundary and approximately 1.5m/2m for the southern end of the boundary. The impact of

the proposed raised ground levels in combination with the layout of the proposed buildings on the amenity of neighbouring property is set out below, on a building by building basis.

8.11 *Block 6*

This proposed building will be positioned at the site entrance to the wider application site adjacent to the entrance green, with the nearest residential property (no. 21 Flexford Close) located approximately 38m to the north-east. As a result of this substantial separation distance, it is considered the proposed building will not materially impact current privacy, daylight or sunlight levels for neighbouring property.

8.12 The orientation and positioning of the proposed building results in the internal spine road separating the proposed building with the proposed accommodation blocks to the west, with a parking court separating Block 6 and the proposed buildings to the north. It is noted that Block 6A is located in closer proximity, however the corresponding side (south) elevation that faces Block 6 only comprises windows serving secondary living areas such as internal hallways and a study. Consequently, it is considered that the layout of this proposed building is acceptable and will provide sufficient amenity to potential future occupants of the proposed development and neighbouring residential properties.

8.13 *Block 6A*

The proposed accommodation building annotated as Block 6A comprises two 'cottage style' units and is in an offset position relative to the nearest neighbouring property (no. 21 Flexford Close). As a result of this offset positioning and the type of accommodation proposed, the rear (east) elevation of the proposed building will not directly face the neighbouring property and does not contain any first floor fenestration with the exception of two small rooflights. The proposed side (north) elevation does include a ground and first floor window, but this fenestration will be positioned approximately 21m away from no. 21 Flexford Close and will not directly face the neighbouring dwelling or residential garden. Therefore, notwithstanding that the proposed building will be on higher ground than the neighbouring property, it is considered that the relative impact on neighbouring property would be acceptable.

8.14 *Block 7*

The impact of Block 7 on number 21 Flexford Close formed part of the first reason for refusal of the previous application reference 21/02697/RESS (paragraph 4.1). Set out below is a comparison between the current proposal and this previous application for Block 7:

	21/02697/RESS	Current Proposal	Difference
Number of units	6.	4.	Reduction of 2 units.

Finished Floor Level	Approx 34.4 AOD.	Approx 34.4 AOD.	No change.
Minimum separation distance to no. 21 Flexford Close boundary	16m.	23.6m.	Increased by 7.6m.

- 8.15 In response to the refusal of the previous design due to the identified overbearing impact on no. 21 Flexford Close, the number of units within Block 7 has been reduced from 6 to 4. This amendment has enabled a greater separation distance with the boundary of 21 Flexford Close as highlighted in the table above, with an increase of 7.6m. In addition, the design of the rear (east) elevation has been amended, limiting the proposed fenestration within the section directly parallel with the neighbouring garden area to two windows serving an internal corridor. In comparison with the previous design which included at least 4 windows serving main living areas, it is considered the reduction in and design amendments to the proposed fenestration has minimised the potential of any significant overlooking.
- 8.16 It is acknowledged previously proposed balcony areas at both the northern and southern end of the rear (east) elevation remain, but these are now positioned a minimum of approximately 25m away at the northern end and 34m at the southern end. Furthermore, due to their juxtaposition with 21 Flexford Close, the proposed balcony areas will be located in an offset location relative to the neighbouring garden area.
- 8.17 Consequently, it is considered the design amendments undertaken are sufficient to overcome the previously identified overbearing impact on 21 Flexford Close, and will ensure the privacy, daylight and sunlight provision of neighbouring property is protected.
- 8.18 *Block 8*
Block 8 is a two storey building in a rectangular form, positioned adjacent to the driveway areas serving no.'s 21 and 23 Flexford Close as well as the intervening turning head. Consequently, whilst the rear (east) elevation of this proposed building does contain ground floor and first floor fenestration, any available views will avoid direct overlooking of residential gardens and windows present on the neighbouring properties. In addition, privacy screens will be added to the balcony areas on the front (west) and rear (east) elevations of the proposed building for those balconies closest to the Flexford Close boundary as secured by the imposition of condition (no. 16). Therefore, it is considered that the layout and design of Block 8 will avoid any materially significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties with regard to privacy, daylight and sunlight provision.

8.19 *Block 9*

The impact of Block 9 on number 55 Flexford Close formed part of the first reason for refusal of the previous application reference 21/02697/RESS (paragraph 4.1). Set out below is a comparison between the current proposal and this previous application for Block 9:

	21/02697/RESS	Current Proposal	Difference
Number of units	8	4	Reduction of 4 units.
Finished Floor Level	Approx 35.9 AOD.	Approx 35.9 AOD.	No change.
Minimum separation distance to no. 55 Flexford Close boundary	17m.	24.6m.	Increased by 7.6m.

8.20 In response to the refusal of the previous design due to the identified overbearing impact on no. 55 Flexford Close, the number of units within Block 9 has been reduced from 8 to 4. This has enabled a greater separation distance between Block 9 and the boundary of 55 Flexford Close, as highlighted in the table above. Consequently, the minimum separation distance is now in excess of 24m. This increase in separation distance is also achieved in part through the repositioning of Block 9 at angle to the boundary with 55 Flexford Close, with the proposed building sloping away from the neighbouring plot when progressing towards the rear residential garden area. Furthermore, the amount of fenestration within the rear (east) elevation has been reduced in comparison to the previous scheme although it is acknowledged the current proposal retains both ground floor and first floor fenestration.

8.21 As a result of these design amendments, and in particular the significant increase in separation distance when compared to the previous scheme, it is considered the previously identified overbearing impact on 55 Flexford Close has been overcome, and the proposal will ensure the privacy, daylight and sunlight provision of neighbouring property is protected.

8.22 *Block 11*

Block 11 is a two storey linear building orientated with the side (east) elevation the boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close, positioned directly opposite the corresponding side elevation of the neighbouring property no. 57 Flexford Close. Following an amendment to the design of this proposed building, the two windows in the side (east) elevation of Block 11 will be fitted with frosted glass to prevent any direct views of the neighbouring property (secured by condition no. 16). In addition, there are two side (east) windows for the bay projection on the south elevation of the proposed building but due to their placement in relation to no. 57 Flexford Close, any views will be limited to the driveway area of the neighbouring property.

8.23 Therefore, it is considered that the design of the proposed building in conjunction with the separation distance will ensure that notwithstanding the change in ground levels, there will be no materially significant harm to the amenity and living conditions of no. 57 Flexford Close.

8.24 *Block 12*

The proposed building annotated as Block 12 on the submitted drawings is also a two storey linear building orientated with the side (east) elevation facing the boundary with Monks Brook and Flexford Close. The proposed building will be positioned opposite the end section of the residential garden area serving no. 57 Flexford Close. Following the amendments undertaken, the proposed windows at the southern end of the side (east) elevation will be fitted with frosted glass to prevent clear views of the neighbouring properties. As a result, there are no windows directly facing Flexford Close with the exception of the side windows for the bay projections on the north elevation. These windows will be positioned opposite the rear boundary of the residential garden area serving no. 57 Flexford Close with a minimum separation distance of approximately 23m.

8.25 As a result, it is considered that notwithstanding the proposed change in ground levels, the proposed design and placement of the fenestration on Block 12 in combination with the separation distance to no. 57 Flexford Close, will ensure the proposed building does not result in any materially significant loss of privacy or daylight and sunlight provision.

8.26 *Block 13*

The impact of Block 13 on the amenity of neighbouring property did not form part of the refusal reasons for application reference 21/02697/RESS (paragraph 4.1). However, the current proposal has amended the previous design of this proposed building, through a reduction to 1 cottage style unit from the previous 3 units proposed. In addition, the single cottage style unit is now orientated on a north to south axis to ensure the side (east) elevation faces the boundary with the Flexford Close properties, in comparison to the previous arrangement which resulted in the rear elevations of the proposed units facing the boundary with Flexford Close. As a result, the intervening distance between the side (east) elevation of the proposed building and the boundary with no. 79 Flexford Close will be a minimum of 21m and a minimum of 27.5m to the neighbouring dwelling itself.

8.27 It is considered these separation distances in combination with the absence of any fenestration proposed on the side (east) elevation will ensure the proposal avoid any materially significant loss of privacy or daylight and sunlight provision for those neighbouring properties positioned in this section of Flexford Close.

8.28 Replacement tree planting

In addition to the separation distances and design of the proposed buildings as identified above, it is noted that the proposed replacement tree planting along Monks Brook will also provide a degree of screening that will further reduce the potential for any overlooking of the Flexford Close properties. A further assessment of the landscape impact of the proposed replacement planting is undertaken below.

- 8.29 Boundary with King Edwards Park (Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5)
For the south-east section of the application site the proposed site plan demonstrates there will be 5 separate buildings, with 4 arranged around a central courtyard and a set of smaller cottage style units (Block 1) located at the front (south) of the application site facing Baddesley Road.
- 8.30 The submitted section drawing for this part of the application site demonstrates that the ground level is significantly lower than that of the adjoining Wheelhouse Park. As a result, the ground floor fenestration present on the two nearest proposed buildings (Blocks 2 and 4) will be screened by the embankment on the boundary of the application site, with only the first floor windows and balconies of the proposed buildings likely to be visible from the neighbouring units within Wheelhouse Park. Typically the units within Wheelhouse Park are laid out so that the parking areas occupy the nearest part of the individual plots facing the application site.
- 8.31 The intervening distance between the first floor fenestration of Blocks 2 and 4 with the nearest caravan units varies significantly but the shortest intervening distance will be approximately 13.5m. It is considered that this separation distance is sufficient to prevent any significant mutual overlooking with the resulting relationship similar to that between residential dwellings facing each other on opposite sides of a road. Furthermore, the separation distance with the units positioned within Wheelhouse Park will also ensure that there is not any materially significant impact on daylight or sunlight for the existing residential units.
- 8.32 Boundary with Trodds Copse (Blocks 14, 14A, 17 and 19)
The proposed buildings to be located adjacent to Trodds Copse will be separated from neighbouring properties, by the other proposed development and the previously approved Village Centre building. It is therefore considered that there will be no material impact arising from this part of the proposed scheme and the residential amenity of neighbouring property.
- 8.33 Impact on potential future occupants
It is considered the proposed layout retains sufficient separation distances between the areas of high amenity for each individual unit to ensure that an acceptable level of amenity for potential future occupants will be achieved.
- 8.34 Conclusion on neighbouring amenity
Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered the proposal sufficiently provides for the amenity both existing and proposed residential and as such, the application is in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the TVBRLP.
- 8.35 **Impact on the character and appearance of the area**
Design
The design, form and external materials for the proposed development follows the approach adopted for the previously approved reserved matters parcel (application reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.5). This approach comprises a traditional design with the proposed buildings characterised by pitched roof forms split up into varying ridge heights and a mixture of external

materials featuring red brickwork, vertical clay hanging tiles, timber panelling and render panels. These materials are characteristic of the residential properties in the locality, as identified in the Ampfield Village Design statement.

- 8.36 When viewing the application site from Baddesley Road to the south, the appearance of the proposed development will be softened by the presence of the entrance green and mature planting at the front of the application site. As set by the parameters plan that accompanied the original outline planning permission, there will be a clear hierarchy in scale of the proposed buildings throughout the whole development, with smaller units typically located at the front of the application site, leading to the main Village Centre building towards the rear. Consequently, it is considered the appearance of the proposed scheme when viewed from Baddesley Road will complement and respect the settlement character of the area.
- 8.37 In relation to the impact on views available from Flexford Close, third party representations have raised concern in relation to the height of the proposed buildings appearing visually at odds with the neighbouring properties, in addition to the harm arising from the appearance of drainage infrastructure within the Monks Brook embankment. However, it is considered that the height and appearance of the proposed development is an inevitable outcome of the difference in ground levels, rather than a flaw in the proposed design.
- 8.38 With regard to the appearance of the proposed development from views within the application site, the proposed buildings are typically orientated to address the main internal spine road and comprise a mixture and variety of features within the same palette of external materials. As a result, it is considered the appearance of the current proposal will fit with the design of the previously approved reserved matters parcel (application reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.5). Notwithstanding the approval of external materials schedule as part of the previous reserved matters approval, a condition has been imposed to secure the final specification of external materials to account for potential supply issues with particular manufacturers.
- 8.39 Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the appearance of the proposed development will complement and respect with the settlement character of the area. As a result, the application is in accordance with Policy E1 of the TVBRLP and the design guidance of the Ampfield Village Design statement.
- 8.40 Landscaping and Trees
In support of the proposal a landscape masterplan and strategy has been submitted detailing the proposed landscape areas and the type of vegetation to be planted (native hedgerow, ornamental shrubs etc) throughout the proposed development. This strategy also includes the removal of the existing tree belt along the Monks Brook boundary to be replaced by a mix of Crack Willow, Alder, Wild Service Tree, Holly, Yew, Oak and Lime with the final mix and size of planting secured through the imposition of a condition (no.13).

8.41 As demonstrated by the commentary within the officer report produced for the outline planning permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8), the existing tree belt along Monks Brook was previously identified to be progressively removed, with paragraph 8.58 of the May 2018 report stating as follows:

Impact on Flexford Close

The houses in Flexford Close are separated from the site by Monks Brook. The application proposes to include an 8 metre river maintenance buffer between the boundary with Flexford Close and any built development. The boundary between the Flexford Close and the site consists of tall conifer/pine/cypress trees. These currently screen the site from the residents of Flexford Close. It is proposed to progressively remove these trees once new planting has been established. The indicative landscape proposals submitted with the application show that a screen along Monks Brook between the site and the dwellings at Flexford Close would be retained however, further details of this would be included with any reserved matters submission.

8.42 It is acknowledged that the proposed replacement tree planting to be located along the Monks Brook boundary is unlikely to provide the same extent of coverage as the existing tree belt. However, it is not considered necessary in landscape terms for the proposed replacement planting to achieve the same extent of coverage as the existing trees, which served to provide a complete screen between Flexford Close and the previous industrial use of the application site. Although there will be a reduction in coverage, the proposed replacement planting will result in a tree lined boundary and backdrop for the proposed development whilst improving the mix and range of tree species. In combination with the retained Oak trees in the centre of the application site and additional planting proposed throughout the whole development, it is considered the proposed scheme will achieve a verdant aesthetic that characterises the settlement area. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will avoid a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area.

8.43 To ensure the successful establishment of the proposed replacement planting, a condition has been imposed to secure the submission of the specific species mix along Monks Brook and composition of tree pits/soil volumes for all proposed tree planting. With this detail secured and subsequent further input from the Landscape and Tree officers, it is considered the establishment of the proposed planting will be achieved.

8.44 In addition, it is noted the Landscape officer comments raise concern with respect to the original designed entrance wall feature, but this aspect of the proposal has been subsequently revised and simplified as reflected in the submission of the amended plans. Updated comments from the Landscape officer to this aspect of the proposal remain outstanding at the time of writing but will form part of an update paper.

8.45 Third party representations have referenced the inclusion of vegetation around the Pumping station adjacent to the south-east corner of the application site on the submitted drawings, but this is only shown for indicative purposes. As such, this vegetation has not formed part of the assessment of the proposed landscape strategy.

8.46 Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the proposed landscaping scheme is acceptable and in accordance with Policy E2 of the TVBRLP.

8.47 Local Gap

The application is located within the Ampfield-Chandlers Ford/Valley Park Local Gap as designated by Policy E3 of the TVBRLP. In assessing the acceptability of redeveloping the application site as part of the original outline planning permission, it was concluded that the appearance of the structures and paraphernalia associated with the previous industrial and storage use, enabled the site to be redeveloped without further diminishing the integrity and appearance of the Local Gap. As part of achieving this objective, it was identified that any future redevelopment of the application site should incorporate landscaped boundaries with buildings set back from Baddesley Road, to ensure that the appearance of development was contained and a rural character maintained. As set out above, the proposed scheme is considered to deliver these objectives through compliance with the previous parameters plan, and the implementation of an acceptable landscape strategy. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal will avoid any material harm to the Ampfield-Chandlers Ford/Valley Park Local Gap and the application is in accordance with Policy E3 of the TVBRLP.

8.48 **Ecology**

Onsite biodiversity

Third party representations have raised concern that the proposed scheme will result in an adverse impact on protected species and habitats with particular reference to the removal of the existing trees on the Monks Brook boundary. However, as explained in the preceding section titled 'Trees', the trees were previously identified for removal as part of the outline planning permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS and are to be replaced with trees of a wider species mix than currently present onsite whilst retaining this important wildlife corridor.

8.49 Furthermore, the proposed designated Entrance and Central Green areas and additional landscape planting throughout the proposed development will result a net increase in onsite vegetation, when compared to the previous industrial and storage use of the application site. Consequently, it is considered that the redevelopment of the wider application site for care accommodation will sufficiently offset the ecological value of the existing trees.

8.50 As identified in the submitted Ecological Impact Assessment and initial response received from Natural England, it is necessary to secure the implementation of a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (hereafter CEMP) to ensure there is no accidental damage on the on the designated Trodds Copse site that borders the application site to the rear. This has been achieved through the

securing of the CEMP previously submitted and approved for the wider Care Village development (condition no 5) as it is considered the protection measures within this plan such as the maintenance of a buffer with Trodds Copse and the supervision of an accredited ecologist during site clearance works remain relevant and acceptable. In addition, the requirement for the development to inform all contractors working onsite of the protected status is secured by the imposition of a separate condition (no. 4).

- 8.51 A further condition has been imposed to secure precise specification details of all external lighting to ensure there is no significant harm to bats from light spill (no. 17). As a result, it is considered that sufficient measures have been secured to ensure there is no significant harm to any onsite protected species or habitats.
- 8.52 Offsite biodiversity: Nutrient Neutrality
Natural England have advised that there are high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus input to the water environment of the Solent region caused by wastewater from existing housing and from agricultural sources and that these nutrients are causing eutrophication at the designated nature conservation sites which includes the Solent Water SPA. This results in dense mats of green algae that are impacting on the Solent's protected habitats and bird species.
- 8.53 Natural England further advises that there is uncertainty as to whether new housing growth will further deteriorate designated sites. Work on this issue is on-going with the local planning authorities, the Environment Agency and the water companies. That may lead to identified mitigation measures in the future.
- 8.54 In the meantime, Natural England advises that one way to address the uncertainty is to achieve nutrient neutrality whereby an individual scheme would not add to nutrient burdens. In this instance, a nutrient budget calculation was previously undertaken to identify the total additional nitrate output of the proposed development as part of the previous application reference 21/02697/RESS (paragraph 4.1).
- 8.55 This previous budget calculation undertaken is reliant on the use of an average 1.35 occupancy rate instead of the Natural England standard methodology rate of 2.4. To justify this total, evidence of the occupancy rates for other existing care villages within the applicant's control was provided for review on the previous reserved matters application reference 20/00488/RESS (paragraph 4.5), identifying an average occupancy rate of 1.4 for this type of accommodation across the industry. This data demonstrated that the occupancy rate of 1.35 was an accurate reflection for the type of accommodation proposed, with the legal agreement completed at outline planning permission stage limiting occupancy to those receiving a minimum care package of 1.5 hours per week. As set out in sections 9 and 10 below, this occupation limitation will apply to the current proposal through the completion of a legal agreement prior to the issuing of planning permission.

- 8.56 Consequently, it is considered that the use of 1.35 as an alternative occupancy rate is acceptable and in accordance with the principles the appropriate assessment undertaken for the previous reserved matters approval issued under application reference 20/00488/RESS (paragraph 4.5). Natural England previously responded to this appropriate assessment raising no objection.
- 8.57 This previous budget calculation was also informed by the predominantly industrial historic land uses as identified by the previous lawful development certificate issued under application reference 16/01889/CLES (paragraph 4.11). Given that the historic land uses have been subject to formal assessment for the issuing of the lawful development certificate, it is considered that this approach is sufficiently robust and precautionary.
- 8.58 As a result of the inputs for population and land use, the previous budget calculation identifies that the proposed development will result in an additional nutrient generation of 178.7 kg/TN/yr. Since the undertaking of the previous nutrient budget, Natural England have updated the budget calculation tool to account for the anticipated upgrades to wastewater treatment works. Given the proposed development will connect to Chickenhall wastewater treatment works, it is anticipated the previous budget figure will represent the likely maximum nutrient loading generated by the proposal. A final budget figure will be confirmed through the undertaking of an Appropriate Assessment in consultation with Natural England.
- 8.59 To offset this impact on the designated Solent sites, it is proposed to purchase credits from a strategic mitigation scheme, with a scheme administered by Eastleigh Borough Council currently identified. This strategic mitigation scheme comprises the cessation of agricultural uses of over 238 hectares of land predominantly located at sites in Bishopstoke, West End, Botley and Fair Oak. Through direct purchase, Eastleigh Borough Council are able to ensure that the previous agricultural activity and the associated generation of nutrients is prevented. This reduction in nutrients entering the designated Solent sites is subsequently offered to developers as credits to offset the impact arising from development.
- 8.60 This principle of removing land from agricultural use to generate a reduction in nutrients entering the designated Solent sites is the same basis underpinning TVBC's strategic mitigation scheme at Roke Manor Farm in Awbridge. Although the strategic mitigation scheme administered by Eastleigh Borough Council is located in a different borough to the application site, the mitigation applies to the same river catchment areas. As a result, the offsetting of agricultural land will still benefit the same designated ecology sites impacted by the proposed development.
- 8.61 To ensure that strategic mitigation schemes are robustly, delivered, monitored and where appropriate subject to any necessary enforcement measures, legal agreements are usually entered into with developers and landowners. Where mitigation is cross-boundary the co-operation of neighbouring local authorities is required.

- 8.62 In order to allow TVBC to engage in cross-boundary agreements, Section 33 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 provides the opportunity for neighbouring Councils to agree to ascribe powers of Enforcement to other Councils who may request such powers in relation to monitoring of strategic mitigation schemes. Under section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 a Local Authority may arrange for the discharge of any of their functions by another Local Authority. A section 33 agreement between Eastleigh Borough Council and TVBC has been completed, enabling the monitoring and enforcement of the proposed nutrient mitigation scheme to be undertaken by Eastleigh Borough Council.
- 8.63 Therefore, subject to the developer demonstrating that sufficient mitigation credits have been secured from Eastleigh Borough Council which is typically demonstrated through the obtainment of a vesting certificate, then it is considered that the proposed mitigation measures are sufficiently robust. This conclusion is subject to confirmation Natural England that have no objections through the completion of an Appropriate Assessment.
- 8.64 Offsite biodiversity: Phosphate Neutrality
As referred to in the preceding section, Natural England have advised there are high levels of nitrogen and phosphorous input into Solent designated sites. In this instance, the application site is located on land where additional phosphate as well as nutrient generation can lead to harm to protected species and habitats. Consequently, it is necessary for the proposed development to demonstrate phosphate neutrality as well as nutrient neutrality.
- 8.65 Based on the same principles outlined in relation to nutrient neutrality, the same additional population input was used for the phosphate budget undertaken for the previous application reference 20/00488/RESS (paragraph 4.5). This calculation identified the proposed development will generate an additional 3.49 Kg/yr of phosphates. Due to the updated budget calculator tool accounting for the forthcoming upgrades to wastewater treatment works, it is anticipated the final budget total will be reduced from the initial total of 3.49 Kg/yr.
- 8.66 To offset the potential additional phosphate loading, it is proposed to purchase credits from the strategic mitigation scheme administered by Eastleigh Borough Council. In the same manner that the cessation of previous agricultural activity on land purchased by Eastleigh Borough Council will result in a decrease in nutrient, there is also a reduction in phosphate loading albeit to a lesser extent.
- 8.67 Although a section 33 agreement has yet to be completed between TVBC and Eastleigh Borough Council, a draft agreement has been formulated on the same principles as that adopted for the section 33 agreement for the nutrient mitigation scheme. Therefore, subject to Natural England review of an Appropriate Assessment and the developer submitting evidence of the purchase of sufficient credits, it is considered that the additional phosphate loading will be sufficiently mitigated.

8.68 Conclusion on protected species and habitats

Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered that the proposed development will avoid any material harm to protected species and habitats onsite in addition to protecting offsite designated ecology sites. As a result, the application is in accordance with Policy E5 of the TVBRLP.

8.69 **Water Management**

Flood Risk

The majority of the application site is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such is considered to be at the least risk of flooding. Part of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 which are at higher risk of flooding. In terms of historical flooding, the Test Valley Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) does not contain any records of flooding at the site, in addition, the Environment Agency do not hold any records of flooding at the site.

8.70 In support of the application, a Flood Risk Assessment (Cole Easdon, September 2023) has been submitted confirming all of the development proposed will be located within Flood Zone 1. Notwithstanding this, as part of the wider application site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and as the proposed use of the site would be considered a 'more vulnerable' use (table 3 in the NPPF technical guidance), a sequential test and exception test are required.

8.71 In support of the original outline application, a Flood Zone Sequential & Exception Test Report (Pegasus Group, February 2018) was submitted. This report concluded the application site was sequentially preferable and the overall benefits of redeveloping the wider application site would deliver wider sustainability benefits to the community. This conclusion was not disputed by planning officers or the Environment Agency.

8.72 It is considered the previously provided assessment remains pertinent to the current proposal, particularly given the proposal does not seek to exceed the amount or type of development subject to the original outline planning permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8). This is further demonstrated by the inclusion of the application site with the Local Planning Authority's most recent housing land supply position and the response provided by the Environment Agency, again raising no objection to the proposal.

8.73 With regard to the requirement for ensuring the proposed development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere, the Flood Risk Assessment (Cole Easdon, September 2023) submitted for the current application confirms the Monks Brook channel and culvert have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 1 in 100 year flood event without any further flooding elsewhere. This result is partly achieved through the implementation of the onsite drainage strategy discussed in further detail below.

8.74 Consequently, it is considered the supporting information submitted with the current application in combination with the planning history of the application site demonstrates compliance with both national and local flood risk planning policy.

8.75 Surface Water drainage

The submitted surface follows the previously approved approach of controlled release into the adjoining Monks Brook watercourse, with the proposed drainage infrastructure such as cellular tanking to be incorporated into proposed development. These features will ensure the betterment of run-off rates in comparison to those experienced before the redevelopment of the wider application site commenced.

8.76 Following a review of the technical strategy, the Lead Local Flood Authority raised no objection subject to additional detail setting out measures to avoid ponding around the proposed buildings which has been secured through the imposition of a condition (no. 11).

8.77 Following the receipt of amended plans revising the layout of Block 13, additional consultation requests have been sent to both the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure the modest changes to the proposed layout do not trigger the requirement for additional details. These updated comments have not been provided at the time of writing but will be included as part of the update paper for the application.

8.78 Conclusion on water management

Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered the proposed scheme will avoid any materiality significant with respect to the integrity of water quality assets in addition to fluvial and surface water flood risk. Consequently, the application is in accordance with Policy E7 of the TVBRLP.

8.79 **Impact on the general amenity of the area**

Foul drainage

The proposed development will be served a connection to mains sewerage and in particular Chickenhall wastewater treatment works. It is considered this proposed foul drainage arrangement is acceptable and will avoid any significant polluting impact on the general amenity of the area. On this matter, it is noted the response from Eastleigh Borough Council references a concern in relation to the capacity of wastewater treatment works to accommodate the proposed development, but no further substantive evidence has been provided. However, this is a separate matter between Southern Water and the applicant.

8.80 Noise

Third party representations have raised a concern the proposed scheme will result in an adverse noise impact on the general amenity of the area. It is considered however the erection of the proposed care accommodation will not generate a level or type of noise materially harmful to the adjoining settlement area, particularly given the previous industrial use of the application site for industrial and storage purposes.

8.81 Traffic Pollution

Concern has been raised in relation to the potential pollution impact arising from traffic generation. However, the proposed development is located within an established settlement area and the type of accommodation proposed typically generates less vehicle movements than those associated with residential

dwellings (further commentary on this matter is set out below in paragraphs 8.85 to 8.90). As a result, it is not considered this matter forms a reasonable basis for refusing the planning application.

8.82 Construction disturbance

Third party representations have raised concern with regard to potential disturbance to properties within Flexford Close arising from the associated construction phase of the proposed development. Given the scale of the development proposed in this instance, it is acknowledged there will be a transient impact on neighbouring amenity during the construction process. However, to minimise this impact, several controls have been included as part of the officer recommendation including the implementation of a CEMP and construction traffic management plan in addition to a restriction on construction hours (no. 7). As a result, it is not considered this matter forms a reasonable basis for refusing the planning application.

8.83 Contamination

A remediation strategy for any contaminative materials onsite has previously been agreed through the approval of condition details secured as part of the original outline planning permission under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8). As such and given construction onsite has already significantly progressed at the time of writing, it is considered the prospect of additional contaminative material to be present onsite is limited. However, a condition (no. 18) has been imposed to secure the submission and approval of a further remediation strategy should this occur.

8.84 Conclusion on the impact on the general amenity of the area

Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered the proposal will avoid any material harm to the general amenity of the area and therefore, the application is in accordance with Policy E8 of the TVBRLP.

8.85 Highways

Access

The proposed development will be served by the existing vehicular access onto Baddesley Road as previously approved under the original outline application reference 17/10615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8). The proposed scheme will not in combination with the other previously approved accommodation onsite (application reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.5) exceed the amount of development approved in the outline application. This previous outline application included an assessment of the impact arising from the number of additional vehicle trips generated on the local road network, concluding that sufficient capacity is available to avoid any materially significant harm to highway safety.

8.86 The current application is supported by a Transport statement (Cole Easdon, August 2023) identifying the generation of approximately 270 daily vehicle trips from the occupation of the proposed 91 units, with the Highways officer again raising no objection to the amount of additional vehicle trips generated. This conclusion is subject to the submission and implementation of a Travel Plan encouraging greater use of public transport where possible. The requirement for

the implementation of a Travel Plan will form part of the legal agreement to be completed prior to the issuing of planning permission. As a result, it is considered the proposal includes sufficient measures to ensure there is no adverse impact on the highway safety of the local road network, either in isolation or in combination with the previously approved development onsite. Therefore, the application is in accordance with Policy T1 of the TVBRLP.

8.87 Traffic Plan

Previously the legal agreement completed for the outline planning permission issued under application reference 17/01615/OUTS (paragraph 4.8) included the requirement for the implementation of a travel plan, the purpose of which was to encourage the wider use of public transport. It is considered the opportunity to encourage the wider use of public transport remains relevant and therefore this requirement has been carried forward as part of the legal agreement to be completed prior to the issuing of planning permission.

8.88 Parking

Annexe G of the TVBRLP sets out a minimum parking standard for supported accommodation as 1 space per unit of accommodation provided. In addition, the minimum parking standards also include a standard of 1 space designated as visitors parking for every 5 units of accommodation. For the 91 units included within the current proposal (as summarised in the table set out at paragraph 3.2) this would trigger the requirement for 109 spaces to serve the proposed living accommodation.

8.89 In support of the application, a highways technical note has been provided highlight the vehicle ownership rates for occupants at other supported accommodation sites located outside the Borough submitted in support of the previous reserved matters application (reference 20/00488/RESS, paragraph 4.5). The data from the other existing sites identified vehicle ownership rates for residents equated to 0.75 spaces per unit. Given that these other sites comprise the same type of accommodation as currently proposed, it is considered that the data submitted represents sufficient justification to depart from the standard within Annexe G of the TVBRLP.

8.90 Applying the vehicle ownership rate of 0.75 per unit to the current proposal, a total of 68 spaces in addition to 18 spaces for visitor parking is required resulting in an overall requirement for 86 spaces onsite. In this instance, a total of 94 spaces has been included within the current proposal with no objection raised by the Highways officer to the parking layout proposed and availability of manoeuvring space onsite.

8.91 Refuse Provision

In support of the proposal a refuse strategy for the proposed accommodation has been submitted demonstrating the provision of onsite bin stores, and the identification of individual collection points along the main internal spine road for each proposed building.

8.92 Whilst the number of bins presented for collection does not qualify as the most efficient arrangement, the commitment for onsite care staff to present the bins for collection along the main internal spine road will offset any inconvenience caused. In addition, the refuse strategy has been updated to demonstrate that the proposed facilities will be able to accommodate the anticipated food waste collection service. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed refuse strategy is acceptable.

8.93 Construction

To minimise disturbance arising from the generation of construction vehicle movements, the proposal will be subject to the same construction management plan that applies to the development currently under construction, as secured by the imposition of condition no.6. This plan includes measures for onsite contractor parking, wheel washing facilities and restrictions on the timings for deliveries. As a result, it is considered sufficient measures are in place to minimise disturbance from construction traffic.

8.94 Conclusion on highway matters

Following the assessment undertaken above, it is considered the proposal will avoid any materially significant harm to the highway safety of the local road network and therefore, the application is in accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of the TVBRLP.

8.95 **Other Matters**

Planning officer site visits

Third party representations have requested the undertaking of site visits by the case officer to assess the impact of the proposed development. Although it is acknowledged the case officer has not visited every property within Flexford Close directly adjacent to the application site, it is confirmed the case officer has visited Flexford Close on multiple occasions during the course of the application.

8.96 Enforcement

Concern has been raised that the raising of ground levels at the application site has not been subject to enforcement action, however this is a separate matter to the assessment of the planning application.

8.97 Property Values

Reference has been made within third party representations to the potential impact of the proposal on property values, but this matter is not material to the assessment of the planning application.

8.98 Democratic Rights

Third party representations have raised concerns with respect to democratic rights. Notification letters have been sent to third parties on validation of the application and the receipt of amended plans received on the 13th February. Therefore, sufficient measures have been taken to enable third parties to submit comments for consideration.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The proposal is considered acceptable and in accordance with the policies of the TVBRLP, therefore the recommendation is for permission.

- 9.2 This recommendation is subject to return of satisfactory responses from the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority to the updated drainage strategy, in addition to completion of a satisfactory Appropriate Assessment in consultation with Natural England.
- 9.3 Prior to the issuing of planning permission a legal agreement securing occupation limitations consistent with previous permissions, the implementation of a Travel Plan and mitigation measures to avoid any harm to the offsite internationally designated ecology sites will also need to be completed.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building for:

- **Satisfactory updated consultation responses from Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority to the updated drainage strategy.**
- **Completion of a satisfactory Appropriate Assessment in consultation with Natural England.**
- **Addition of any necessary conditions to secure mitigation measures enabling the proposed development to achieve nitrate and phosphate neutrality.**
- **Completion of a legal agreement to secure:**
 - **Restriction of occupation of the units of accommodation consistent with the Basic Care Package defined in the legal agreement for application reference 17/01615/OUTS;**
 - **Operation of care facilities by person or body registered by the Care Quality Commission as a Service Provider;**
 - **Submission and implementation of a Travel Plan;**
 - **Delivery of sufficient mitigation to ensure the development achieves nitrate neutrality;**
 - **Delivery of sufficient mitigation to ensure the development achieves phosphate neutrality;**

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. **The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans:**
 - Site Location Plan (2496-URB-CF-00-DR-A-208910 P00)**
 - Proposed Site Layout Plan (2496-URB-CF-00-DR-A-208150 P01)**
 - Proposed Refuse Strategy (2496-URB-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-206920 P01)**
 - Proposed Bin Store - Type 1 - Floor Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-BS-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)**
 - Proposed Bin Store - Type 2 - Floor Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-BS-ZZ-DR-A-208161 P00)**
 - Proposed Bin Store - Type 3A - Floor Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-BS-ZZ-DR-A-208153)**

Proposed Block 01 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B01-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 02 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plan (2496-URB-B02-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 02 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B02-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 03 - Ground and First Floor Plans (2496-URB-B03-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 03 - Roof Plan (2496-URB-B03-ZZ-DR-A-208161 P00)

Proposed Block 03 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B03-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 04 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B04-00-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 04 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B04-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 05 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B05-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P01)

Proposed Block 05 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B05-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P01)

Proposed Block 06 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B06-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 06 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B06-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 06A - Plans, Elevations and Section (2496-URB-B6A-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 07 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B07-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 07 - Elevations and Sections as Proposed (2496-URB-B07-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 08 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B08-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 08 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B08-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 09 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B09-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 09 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B09-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 11 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B11-00-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 11 - Elevations and Sections - Sheet 1 (2496-URB-B11-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 12 - Ground, First Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B12-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 12 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B12-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 13 Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-B13-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P01)

Proposed Block 14 - Ground and First Floor Plan (2496-URB-B14-00-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 14 - Roof Plan (2496-URB-B14-01-DR-A-208161 P00)

Proposed Block 14 - Elevations and Sections - Sheet 1 (2496-URB-B14-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P01)

Proposed Block 14 - Elevations and Sections - Sheet 2 (2496-URB-B14-ZZ-DR-A-208261 P01)

Proposed Block 14A - Plans and Elevations (2496-URB-B14A-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 17 - Ground, First, Second Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B17-ZZ-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 17 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B17-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Block 19 - Ground, First, Second Floor and Roof Plans (2496-URB-B19-00-DR-A-208160 P00)

Proposed Block 19 - Elevations – (2496-URB-B19-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00)

Proposed Landscape Masterplan (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208151 P05)

Proposed Entrance Feature Wall - Sheet 1 of 2 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208005 P03)

Proposed Entrance Feature Wall - Sheet 2 of 2 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208006 P02)

Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 1 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208001 P08)

Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 2 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208002 P04)

Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 3 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208003 P04)

Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 4 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208004 P05)

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

- 3. The development hereby permitted shall be used only as residential care accommodation and for no other purpose, including any purpose in Class C2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification.**

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority can exercise control in the locality in the interest of the local amenities in accordance with Policy COM2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 4. All those involved with the development should be informed of the status and legal obligations attached to the Trodds Copse SSSI designation and where the boundary of the protected area is.**

Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 5. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the measures set out in the submitted document titled ‘Land at Baddesly Road – Ampfield Care Village, Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP): Biodiversity’ dated 4th February 2020, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: To avoid impacts to protected sites and species and to conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
- 6. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the construction traffic management measures set out in the submitted document titled ‘Project Traffic Management Plan’ dated 14th April 2022, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policy T1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.
- 7. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, construction and demolition activities including the delivery or removal of materials to or from the site, shall only take place between the hours of 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and between the hours of 08:00 hours and 13:00 hours on Saturday (excluding Bank Holidays). No such activity shall occur on Sundays or Bank Holidays.**

Reason: In the interest of the amenities in the local area in accordance with Policy LHW4 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- 8. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the drainage strategy set out in the documents titled ‘Surface Water and Foul Drainage Strategy’ (Farrow Walsh, reference FW2111-DS-001 V1, dated July 2023), ‘Drainage Strategy update Cover Note’ (Hydrock, reference 32124-HYD-XX-XX-RP-C-0001) and the following plans:**

Drainage Strategy Sheet 1 of 3 (FW2111-C-600-01)
Drainage Strategy Sheet 2 of 3 (FW2111-C-600-02)
Amended Drainage Strategy Sheet 3 of 3 (32124-HYD-00-ZZ-DR-C-7000-P02)

Thereafter the drainage infrastructure shall be retained and maintained to ensure working order for the lifetime of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development does not trigger an adverse surface water flood risk in accordance with Policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).
- 9. Landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved landscape plans and documents:**

Proposed Landscape Masterplan (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208151 P05)
Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 1 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208001 P08)

Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 2 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208002 P04)

Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 3 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208003 P04)

Landscaping Strategy Plan - Sheet 4 of 4 (2496-URB-CF-ZZ-DR-L-208004 P05)

Monks Brook Corridor Advanced Planting Strategy dated July 2023 (2496-URB-CF-00-SP-L-2A6652 P01)

Outline Landscape Management Plan dated July 2023 (2496-URB-CF-00-SP-L-2A6656)

Arboricultural Survey and Impact Assessment: Phase 2 and 3, Chandler's Ford Continuing Care Retirement Community (Landarb Solutions, August 2023)

The landscape works hereby approved shall be maintained to encourage its establishment for a minimum period of five years following completion of the development. Any trees or planting that are removed, die or become, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective within this period, shall be replaced before the end of the current or first available planting season following the failure, removal or damage of the planting. 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 Policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 10. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the height of the ground floor slab and damp proof course level for each individual building, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure satisfactory relationship between the new development and the adjacent buildings, amenity areas and trees in accordance with Policies E1 and LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 11. Prior to the commencement of development details of the exceedance flow routing, including level information, demonstrating measures to direct water away from the units hereby approved shall be 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 does not result in the deterioration of water quality in accordance with Policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).**
- 12. 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 would integrate, respect and complement the character of the area in accordance with Policy E1 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 13. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved landscape plans, no development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until full details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include:**

- i) Identification of precise species and location for all tree planting**
- ii) Tree pit planting details including soil volume**

The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and implementation/maintenance 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 Policies E1 and E2 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 14. Prior to any occupation of the development hereby approved, a plan showing the layout and position of the designated visitor parking spaces shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the designated visitor parking spaces shall be reserved for this purpose at all times.**

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

- 15. The development shall not be occupied until space has been laid out and provided for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles to enable them to enter and leave the site in a forward gear in accordance with the approved plans and this space shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.**

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

- 16. The proposed buildings annotated as Blocks 9, 11 and 12 shall not be occupied until the obscure glazed windows and privacy screens, as shown on the approved plans reference Proposed Block 09 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B09-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00), Proposed Block 11 - Elevations and Sections - Sheet 1 (2496-URB-B11-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00) and Proposed Block 12 - Elevations and Sections (2496-URB-B12-ZZ-DR-A-208260 P00) are installed.**

Thereafter, the obscure glazed windows and privacy screens shall be retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity and privacy of the adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy LHW4 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016).

- 17. No external lighting shall be installed until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include plans and details sufficient to show the location, type, specification, luminance and angle of illumination of all lights/luminaires. The external lighting shall be**

installed 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).

- 18.** In the event that contamination (that was not previously identified) is found at any time during 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 Policy E8 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.
-