
APPLICATION NO.	18/00877/FULLS
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION - SOUTH
REGISTERED	25.04.2018
APPLICANT	Mr R Barons
SITE	Hyde Farm, Horsebridge Road, Broughton, SO20 8BD, BROUGHTON
PROPOSAL	Removal of existing structures, erection of 9 no. dwellings with associated parking, turning, landscaping and alterations to the existing access
AMENDMENTS	Amended plans and information received on 15/08/2018, 17/08/2018, 29/08/2018, 03/09/2018, 04/09/2018 and 12/09/2018. These amendments included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amended layout• Amended house designs, including amendment to materials schedule• Amended landscaping proposals• Amended flood risk assessment• Amended Arboricultural Impact Assessment• Amended transport statement• Amended ecology report
CASE OFFICER	Mrs Sarah Appleton

Background paper (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application is presented to Southern Area Planning Committee at the request of a Ward Member.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 Hyde Farm is located to the south west of Horsebridge Road in Broughton. The site is situated behind a historic farm complex which includes Hyde Farm House, a grade II listed building. The site is also located within the conservation area in Broughton.

3.0 PROPOSAL

3.1 The proposal involves the removal of the existing stables and other structures on the site and the erection of 9 dwellings with associated parking, turning, landscaping. The proposals also involve the alteration of the existing access.

4.0 HISTORY

4.1 The most recent, relevant planning history for the site itself includes the following:

17/02848/FULLS – Removal of existing structures, erection of 15no. dwellings, associated parking/turning, landscaping and improvements to existing access – WITHDRAWN 18.01.2018.

4.2 The most recent history for the site adjacent (to the south west) is as follows: 13/02765/FULLS – Constriction of a stable building and hay barn – PERMISSION subject to conditions 31.01.2014.

4.3 09/01233/FULLS – Manager’s dwelling with equestrian tie incorporating a hospitality suite and guest accommodation together with stabling and garaging – PERMISSION subject to conditions 09.12.2009.

5.0 CONSULTATIONS

5.1 **Highways** – No objection.

“Plot 1’s car parking is still remote from the front door of the dwelling which is likely to result in vehicles being parked between two sharp bends where inadequate space is left for passing vehicles. A redesign of this house type is recommended.”

The design of plot 1 is likely to lead to the obstruction of the access road to all other plots by the parking of a vehicle close to the front door. This is contrary to Policy T1 of the BLP.”

When asked to clarify the position in relation to concerns raised on the impact the proposed development would have on Horsebridge Road, the highways officer stated the following:

“I have no concerns because the amount of traffic likely to be generated will be very low.”

5.2 **Landscape** – No objection.

- The proposed trees across the whole development will form an important part of the site character and assist in integrating the development within the local and wider landscape.

5.3 **Trees** – Comment (summarised as follows):

- Potentially no objection to the proposal but have concerns regarding species choice in the new tree planting.
- Plans show Oak along the southern boundary. This boundary is in full public view. Oaks are not characteristic of the area. Lime trees have been suggested as a replacement.
- Previous plans show space for large specimen tree planted within the site. This has been omitted from current landscaping plan with Acer Freemanii taking its place. Would be appropriate to remove the middle Acer Freemanii and replace it with a London Plane which would be left to grow to a feature tree on the site.

5.4 **Conservation** – Object, although recognises that the less than substantial harm should be weighted against any public benefits.

Conservation area

- Combination of types of houses proposed and site layout is likely to prevent the development from integrating as well as it could into the locality. Views of the site from the public realm, however, are relatively limited, which should minimise the impact. There is also considerable planting proposed, which, when established will also help to screen the development and maintain the rural character of the area.
- It is concluded that there will be some harm to this part of the conservation area. The level of harm is considered to be less than substantial, and it would not harm the special interest of the designated area as a whole.

5.5 Setting of listed building

- Building houses on this field will, to an extent, cut the farmhouse off from the farmland, which will make it harder to appreciate the historic use aspects of its special interest. That said, the farmhouse will still sit within the remains of its historic group buildings and there will still be some land to the east, and the field to the south-east of the site will remain. Close-to views of Hyde Farm house from the street will be largely unaltered. As such, the public experience will remain much-the-same.
- It is concluded therefore, there will be some harm to the setting and understanding of Hyde Farm house, but that this would be less-than-substantial.

5.6 Summary

- In accordance with policy E9 of the Revised Local Plan, the less-than-substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets through the impacts on their settings should be weighed against any public benefits considered to arise from the proposed development.
- It is noted that an indicative palette of materials has been provided on the application drawings – it is considered a materials samples conditions should be included if permission is granted, as correct materials will be key to blending the development into the locality.

5.7 **Housing** – No objection.

- Financial contribution towards affordable housing is required in accordance with policy COM7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.

5.8 **Environmental Protection** – No objection subject to conditions.

5.9 **Rights of way** – Object but this could be overcome by securing a contribution towards footpath improvements through a legal agreement.

- Planning statement details that pedestrian access to the village and local amenities is proposed along Horsebridge Road, which does not have a footway, or appear wide enough for such provision. The

applicant has suggested that a safer route would be to utilise the public right of way, however, this route will require improvements and dedication of bridleway rights if the path is to be utilised as the main pedestrian and cycle link into the village.

- Have developed some improvements to the rights of way network that could be undertaken to limit the significant adverse impact of the development to be secured through a Section 106 legal agreement. This would involve a financial contribution towards the upgrade to footpaths 6 and 7 which link the site to the village centre.

5.10 **County Ecologist – Comment:**

- Satisfied that the submitted ecological information represent the current conditions at the site – no evidence of bats was found during the visual inspection. One of the buildings was assessed as presenting low roost potential – a single evening visit was carried out to confirm the negative visual finding. No bats were seen to emerge from or return to the building during the survey.
- In view of the survey findings I would advise that the development is unlikely to result in a breach of the law protecting bats and I would raise no concerns but would suggest an informative is added to any permission reminding the applicant of their obligations in relation to bats.
- Ecological survey identified the presence of swallow nests in the stable building. The development will result in the loss of nesting opportunities for this species. There are no specific recommendations to address impacts to this species that have been set out as deliverable. The proposals so include a number of open car ports associated with the dwellings, and these are ideal swallow nest sites. However, due to possible concerns over bird droppings on stored cars, it is inappropriate to actively encourage their use by swallows. Would however welcome further consideration of this species and whether there are any other options of providing artificial swallows nests on buildings on land in the applicants ownership (blue land).
- Proposal presents opportunities for biodiversity gain. Broughton is an important area for bats, and a more coherent biodiversity enhancement scheme would be valuable. The proposed construction of the buildings presents a range of opportunities. There is opportunity to incorporate a biodiversity rich planting grassland along the broader shared frontage along the south eastern boundary with this being managed as a more traditional meadow type feature.
- Would support the landscape comments from a biodiversity perspective – a more typical mix of hedgerow species would provide far greater biodiversity benefits than a single-species beech hedge. A mix including hazel, hawthorn, field maple, rose, spindle etc. would provide a greater diversity of foraging resource for birds/mammals/invertebrates as well as a higher general species diversity.

5.11 **Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection.**

6.0 **REPRESENTATIONS** Expired 01.06.2018

6.1 **Broughton Parish Council – Object:**

Traffic

- Information provided appears to be based on 18 year old data which bears little relevance to today's conditions with vehicle movements having increased greatly since. Home deliveries have increase enormously and are forecast to continue to grow.
- Horsebridge Road is narrow in places with insufficient space for two cars to pass, let alone larger delivery, service and construction vehicles – evidenced by damage to verges, bollards and road edges.
- Majority of traffic to this site would pass through the centre of the village, which is already congested with on street parking.
- A recent consideration of an adjacent site, using the same access, was opposed by the planning authority on traffic and safety grounds.
- All increases in traffic will be additional to the current vehicle movements generated by the stud farm, which will continue in operation.

The following comments have been received from Broughton Parish Council subsequent to the comments made by the highways officer:

“1. The effect increased traffic would have not just on the Horsebridge Road by particularly on the village centre which already suffers from traffic congestion given a combination of parked cars and road narrowness. Traffic volumes (and larger vehicle types) have increased significantly in recent years with home deliveries becoming more common and, for every additional home at the Horsebrdige end of the village, this increases exponentially. To hold the view that traffic generation would be very low seems very ill-judged compared to our daily experience.

2. Regarding pedestrian safety itself; the narrowness of Horsebridge Road near Hyde Farm, the speed and increasing large vehicles passing this way and the lack of a footpath all contribute towards increased risks of an accident here, either vehicle or pedestrian. Build homes at this end of the village and the risks increase.”

6.2 Pedestrian safety

- There are no footpaths along the road from the site to the village centre and there is insufficient road width to create one. It is already dangerous for families to walk this route, and there have been recent instances of pedestrians being struck by the mirrors of passing vehicles.
- Existing footpath from the rear of the site towards the village is not capable of improvement to help alleviate this problem.
- Lack of safe pedestrian access would encourage occupants of the proposed development to use cars even for short journeys further exacerbating existing congestion in the centre of the village.

6.3 Flooding

- Road currently floods by the entrance to the proposed site.
- Applicant has stated that there will be no run-off from the site but has not shown how this can be achieved in the presence of the existing high water table in the area.

6.4 **Romsey and District Society** – Comments:

- Members supported the scheme of redevelopment of the site in principle as it reflects the preference previously given by the Society for the dispersal of new development across the Borough to be within the villages.
- Layout – is considered less sensitive to its setting to the village and adjacent listed buildings. The scheme has missed the opportunity to be based on a farmyard courtyard grouping which would be more appropriate for the site.
- On a matter of detail, plots 2 and 3 are shown to have rear gardens facing south east with no privacy/enclosure from an adjacent track. If some boundary treatment is to be planned, hedging and not fencing would be appropriate here.
- Members suggested that this scheme is presented to the Architects Panel for some design review.

6.5 **36 x** letters of objection received from the first round of consultation
6 x additional letters received in response to the second round of consultation in relation to the submission of amended plans. The comments raised from both rounds of consultation are summarised as follows:

6.6 **Principle of development**

- Village was told that the School Lane site would be all the development needed for the village which is already very busy, many bottlenecks occur in the High Street and near the two pubs, also in School Lane near the surgery.
- School and surgery are at full capacity/oversubscribed.
- There is a lack of housing need in the village. The village does not want this housing.
- The shop is to shortly close.
- Broughton has no need for additional large houses.
- Facilities in the village are already overstretched, the proposed development would exacerbate this.
- To add the proposed development, in combination with the School Lane development would result in overdevelopment for the nature and structure of Broughton.
- Councillors indicated there would be no need for further development because apparent housing needs would have been met.
- Proposed development should be rejected as the Parish Council have indicated that the development at School Lane would meet the village's foreseeable need for housing.

- There is ample supply of housing on the market. Property in current conditions is selling slowly. There are several houses on the market which there appears to be no demand for.
- Public transport in the village is extremely limited.
- The Parish Council strongly objects to the development and assured the village that the housing development at School Lane would meet the housing requirements for the village for the foreseeable future.
- Given the principle of housing development on the site, should a development eventually be allowed, it would have to fully meet all the policy criteria and requirements and this would not be possible with the number and size of the houses proposed.

6.7 Highways

- Exit from Hyde Farm is dangerous.
- Horsebridge Road is a narrow, country lane. There is no footpath and it is becoming increasingly dangerous to walk along independently let alone with pushchairs, toddlers, the elderly etc. due to the increase in vans and lorries using this road. The road verges are becoming more and more eroded. Alternative proposal to use the public footpath is simply unworkable.
- Most journeys to and from the development would be undertaken by car or van and would mean going up through the village.
- Extra volume of traffic created would endanger pedestrians and cyclists.
- The information submitted with the application does not address the highway safety issues.
- Amount of traffic through the village centre has risen, giving serious cause for concern. Essential services are finding delivery to the village more difficult.
- Increase in traffic caused by this proposed development would be substantial and cannot be ignored or dismissed in a one sentence response as given by highways.
- The route through the village to the site is narrow and includes dangerous bends.
- If visiting vehicles were to park on Horsebridge Road, this would further block the sightline and make it even more dangerous.
- Idea that people from the new development with young children/pushchairs would walk into the village as opposed to drive does not seem plausible and the alternative public footpath mentioned is highly unsuitable.
- Proposals would encourage on-street car parking.
- Horsebridge Road is too narrow to take more traffic and barely copes with existing demand.
- Construction traffic would cause significant difficulties.
- Information included in the transport statement is out of date. Impact has been understated by the applicant.

- Traffic survey took place in prime holiday time so is an underestimate of a normal day, on 24 September, I did two spells of traffic observation based half way between the proposed exit and Rookery Lane. This showed 12 vehicles heading north and 10 heading south. During the second session, there were 24 vehicles heading north and 22 heading south. These surveys work out as an average of nearly two vehicle movements every 2 minutes.
- Wide vehicles find it difficult to pass on Horsebridge Road, particularly if there are cars parked on the road.
- Increase in delivery vehicles to the new dwelling would have an adverse impact on highway safety.
- Information showing the PROW conveniently shows the only 25m stretch that is paved and wide, the remaining 400m being narrow, covered with tree roots, with several small gates and grazing sheep.
- Highways consultant is probably applying filters to TRICS to generate stats in the development's favour.
- Highways technical note makes generalised conclusions based on a very brief August holiday time visit.
- Transport statement underplays significantly the other dwellings and businesses on the wider Hyde Farm holding that will be using the same entry/exit point onto Horsebridge Road. Traffic using this access would increase significantly.

6.8 **Amenity**

- Loss of vegetation adjacent to South Road would result in loss of amenity of occupiers of dwellings on South Road.
- There would be mutual overlooking between the proposed new dwellings and the dwellings on South Road.
- Proposals would generate significant noise pollution.

6.9 **Character and appearance**

- Another development in the village would alter the character of the area and make it more suburban.
- Proposal would be inappropriate, overdevelopment. Surely Broughton has done a reasonable amount to alleviate the housing crisis.
- We are in danger of losing the very essence of what the village has to offer. We are not a town.
- Statements within the Village Design Statement should be respected.
- Suburban development areas of dubious architectural quality at each approach to the village seem to completely disregard best planning practice.
- This part of the village only has liner development, comprising well space properties of varying styles, this allows the transition from the countryside into the more densely populated heart of the village. The proposed development in cumulation with associated development (conversion of the kennels into a dwelling and plans to have a further stud) would completely alter the layout and visual impact on the approach to the village.

- Proposal to fell the copse adjacent to South Road would expose the South Road residents to the development and would also increase the visual impact along Horsebridge Road. Proposed replacement planting would not be appropriate, more trees are required for this rural location. The proposal planting would be more appropriate for a suburban area.
- Light pollution would increase and alter this part of the village which at present is dark and peaceful.
- Additional tarmac footpaths would be an unwelcome urbanisation of the village and the proposal to upgrade a rural footpath would spoil the character of the area.
- Proposals would constitute an over development of the site.
- The addition of 9 houses in a small area would give a suburban feel to what is currently a very peaceful rural setting.
- Proposed housing density is not in keeping with this part of the village.
- Site is subject to a number of constraints including topography, large trees, proximity to listed buildings and public right of way which means that some of the site is not appropriate for building – density is therefore likely to be greater than quoted. In a recent ‘edge of village’ planning development in a nearby village with similar conservation and heritage characteristics, an area of 0.76 hectares has accommodated 6 houses and an orchard.
- There would be a three-fold increase in the amount of floor space provided.
- 18 plus cars would not be ‘hidden’ and will be within a concentrated area, incongruous with the character of the prevailing area.
- Cars dominating the street scene would be an ‘eyesore’.
- Designs of the proposed dwellings are inappropriate for this edge of village location and are more likely to be seen in suburbia.
- Proposed designs and palette of materials is still limited and will not ensure that the proposals do not appear as a single semi-urban development .
- Southern approach to Broughton consists of relatively widely spaced, single depth, detached houses. This will be permanently altered by a cluster of large attached properties.
- Loss of trees would detrimentally affect the area’s character.
- Introduction of trees and hedges to presumably try to mitigate the proposed tiny gardens and to conceal the out-of-character nature of the development are wholly inadequate.
- Suggest that TPOs are placed on all the trees in order to preserve them for the future.

6.10 Heritage

- Hyde Farm is a historic building and should be sympathetically treated to retain its character and setting
- Proposed development negatively impacts on the key characteristics of the conservation area. The proposed layout does not respect the historic plan and layout of the village. Proposal is therefore contrary to sections 11 and 12 of the NPPF.

- Number and size of houses would have a huge impact on the street scene in this area as it will be visible from the south, from Horsebridge Road, from the public Right of Way which runs along one side and from South Road.
- Proposed development would be dominant in surrounding views of the village.
- Are we happy to for existing historic farm to become Hyde Housing estate?
- Character issues raised by the Council's conservation Officer have been largely unaddressed.
- Isn't the proposed development in contradiction to the Conservation Area Character Appraisal of March 2009? Won't the proposal undermine the character of the conservation area?
- Disappointing that designs of the dwellings have been changed so little during the amendments given that the Design and Conservation Officer raised concerns.
- Concern that the proposed planting adjacent to South Road would obstruct this road.

6.11 **Flooding/Drainage**

- Part of Horsebridge Road adjacent to the site is prone to serious flooding. Increased run-off from the development would be likely to increase this flooding.
- Area is prone to flooding, the proposal would exacerbate existing flooding problems and would increase flooding elsewhere, putting existing properties at risk.
- Drainage has been an issue, proposal development with associated run off will exacerbate what is already as serious problem.
- Remain unconvinced by the alleged betterment shown in the amended flood report – this report does not seem to provide an objective assessment of the site conditions and issues. Appears to be no appreciation at all that Horsebridge Road contains no form of drainage whatsoever. Do not believe the measures would make any difference to flooding around the site.

6.12 **Lack of affordable housing**

- Disappointing to see this revised application makes no provision for homes that will be affordable to the young of the village and especially those who help drive the local economy.

6.13 **Future development**

- Understand that the perfectly good stables are to be moved elsewhere onto a greenfield site. It is suspected in a few years that this new stable site will then be submitted for housing development. If they deem the stables should be replaced then they should be replaced in situ.
- Concerns that if the stables development is given the green light, the next step would be for the applicant resubmitting their proposals for the next door field, to the east, the one that was previously rejected.
- Concern that a larger development would follow once access road is established.

6.14 **Ecology**

- Loss of vegetation would result in the loss of bird roosting sites and also other habitat.
- Proposals do not seek to preserve, conserve, restore or enhance the biodiversity or green infrastructure of the site.

6.15 **Loss of employment**

- Loss of existing equestrian/stud business on the site would result in a loss of employment.

7.0 **POLICY**

7.1 Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

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

COM2 – Settlement hierarchy

COM15 – Infrastructure

E1 – High quality development in the Borough

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

E5 – Biodiversity

E7 – Water management

E9 - Heritage

LHW4 – Amenity

T1 – Managing movement

T2 – Parking standard

7.3 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

- Broughton Village Design Statement (VDS)

8.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

8.1 The main planning considerations are:

- The principle of development
- Affordable housing
- Impact on the economy
- Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Heritage
- Impact on residential amenity
- Highways and Rights of Way
- Water, drainage and flood risk
- Ecology

8.2 **The principle of development**

The site is situated within the Broughton Settlement Boundary as defined in the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 (RLP). As a result, provided the proposed development complies with the other relevant policies of the RLP, it would be acceptable in principle.

8.3 **Affordable housing**

Policy COM7 of the RLP requires a financial contribution where a development would include a net gain of between 6-9 dwellings. In this case, such a contribution would be equivalent to up to 20% of dwellings to be affordable. Such a contribution is secured by the completion of an appropriate legal agreement. The applicant has confirmed that they are willing to enter into an agreement which, at the time of writing this report, is being processed. Subject to such a contribution being secured, the proposal would comply with policy COM7 of the RLP.

8.4 **Loss of existing equestrian use**

The proposals would replace buildings which are currently being used as a stud (horses) business. Planning permission was granted in 2009 (09/01233/FULLS) and 2013 (13/02765/FULLS) for further stabling and manager's dwelling. The applicant has confirmed that the existing stud business would move to alternative premises to the south of the site where there is extant permission for an equestrian/agricultural workers dwelling along with additional stabling. The proposals would result in the loss of an existing rural business on site, but in the longer term, the business would be retained and operated from new premises to the south of the site.

8.5 **Impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area**

The site is situated on the rural edge on the outskirts of the village. The equestrian use of the site and the low level of the existing stable buildings on the site are obscured from public views from Horsebridge Road by the built form of existing frontage development and surrounding vegetation. From the public right of way to the rear (south west) of the site, views of the existing development on the site are seen in context with surrounding, residential development along South Road.

8.6 Much of the existing residential development in the immediate vicinity of the site is positioned on the south west side of Horsebridge Road. Whilst many of the third party comments state that development along this side of the lane is in a linear form, there is a significant amount of backland development within the vicinity of the site. In particular, South Road includes residential development that is perpendicular to Horsebridge Lane and there are cul-de-sacs located to the north west of the site which take their access off Horsebridge Road ('The Partridges', 'Coolers Farm', and the cul-de-sac which includes 'Heriots, Applegarth' and 'Ivy Cottage'. The dwellings in the surrounding area are mainly detached and of varied/ individual designs set in relatively large plots interspaced with vegetation.

8.7 The development would be adjacent to existing backland development along South Road and would include a cul-de-sac arrangement which is seen elsewhere within the vicinity of the site. The proposal would include 7 detached dwellings and a pair of semi-detached dwellings set in plot sizes that are comparable to those in the surrounding area. The traditional design, scale and massing of the dwellings would include vernacular features and materials.

8.8 From the approach into the village from the south east along Horsebridge Road, some screening of the development would be provided by both existing and proposed vegetation. The development would also be seen in context with adjacent residential development along Horsebridge Road and South Road and in context with buildings within the Hyde Farm complex that are to be retained. Currently, when approaching the site from this side of Horsebridge Road, it is clear that the buildings which make up the current Hyde Farm complex along with the buildings along South Road mark the start of the main part of the village with there being more dispersed areas of development located along Horsebridge Road to the south east. The proposed development would not encroach into the gap between the start of the main part of the village and the more dispersed development on the outlying edges of the village, the development would respect and maintain the existing built form edge of the main part of the village.

8.9 From the approach to the site from the north west along Horsebridge Road, the proposed development would be screened by the existing building form located on the south west side of Horsebridge Road. From the public footpath to the rear of the site, the proposals would be visible, but would be seen in context with surrounding built form.

8.10 As a result of the above, it is considered that the form and layout of the proposed development would satisfactorily integrate, respect and complement the existing character of the area. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with policies E1 and E2 of the RLP in this respect. The impact the proposals would have on trees/landscape are considered below.

8.11 Trees/Landscaping

There are existing trees and other vegetation positioned both within and around the boundaries of the site some of which are proposed for removal including trees/vegetation which are positioned along the north west boundary (adjacent to South Road) and along the south east boundary. The arboricultural report submitted with the application states that within the vegetation along the north west boundary there are:

- a large number of conifers which have died or are dying back;
- a number of fallen trees;
- a number of Beech which have been planted at close spacing. These Beech have had insufficient space to develop individually, resulting in poor form and structure;
- a small number of Beech that, although suffering the effects of group pressure, may develop into better specimens were poorer quality trees be removed.

There are a number of stumps along the south east boundary which are proposed for removal, along with existing Poplar trees. Existing trees within the site including a Weeping Will and Ash are also proposed to be removed. Trees along the south west boundary, which include a number of Field Maple, are proposed to be retained.

- 8.12 The vegetation along the north west boundary, adjacent to South Road is an important landscape feature within the surrounding area however, due to the poor condition of the trees/vegetation within this part of the site, it is accepted that much of it needs to be removed and replaced and adequately managed in order for this feature to be retained in the future. Replacement landscaping proposed by the applicant along this boundary includes the planting of a new, native hedge along with the planting of 14 trees, in two staggered rows, along with under planting.
- 8.13 Replacement planting along the south east boundary is proposed to include the planting of a new native hedge and the planting of trees both along the boundary and within it. The vegetation along the south west boundary is proposed to be retained. The existing native hedge will be cut back to allow for some rejuvenation. The Field Maples along this boundary are proposed to be retained and protected throughout the construction period. Additional, infill planting is proposed where this is required after the existing hedge is cut back.
- 8.14 In addition to the new planting which would replace trees/vegetation that would be lost, additional tree planting/hedgerow planting is proposed within the site, particularly within the proposed communal areas of the development. It is considered that the new/additional landscaping proposed would adequately mitigate against the removal of existing trees/vegetation within the site and would help to retain the rural character of this edge of village site and would thus integrate the development into the surrounding area. The Council's tree officer has been consulted on the proposals and, subject to some amendments relating to the species of the trees proposed, has not raised any objections.
- 8.15 As a result of the above, subject to amended plans revising the species of some of the proposed trees, a condition securing protection for retained trees during the construction phase and subject to a condition securing the replacement/additional planting proposed, it is considered that the development would retain natural/landscape features where possible along with there being provision for additional planting which would help the development to integrate with the character of the surrounding area. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with policy E2 in this regard.
- 8.16 Broughton Village Design Statement
Broughton Village Design Statement (VDS) was adopted in July 2004. The document is a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and is a material planning consideration when determining this application. The VDS sets out to provide '*simple guidance to protect and enhance*' the character of the village.
- 8.17 Page 10 of the VDS provides guidelines for future development in the village, the guidance most relevant to this proposal in relation to design is summarised as follows:

Materials

- Development should reflect original pattern of the existing village in terms of building design and character, layout and scale.

- Mixture of natural slate, tiles and thatch for roofing should be encouraged.
- Use of oak, subtle bricks, rendered and weather boarding should be encouraged
- Use of plastic/upvc for windows and doorframes should be discouraged.

Parking

- Provision of off street parking should be included within any development and this should be hidden from the main street scene.

Boundaries

- New boundaries should be native hedging or if solid of traditional materials such as cob and flint.
- Existing mature native trees within the parish should be retained.
- Planting of new native trees and hedging should be part of any new development

Lighting

- Footpath lighting will be discouraged.
- Footpath lighting within any new development should be low power white light.

8.18 In response to the guidance set out in the VDS, paragraphs 8. to 8. explain that the proposed development would be of a layout and the dwellings would be of a design/scale that reflects the existing character of this part of the village, using vernacular materials. Off-street parking, including visitor parking would be provided on site and would be hidden from the main street. Boundaries of the site would include existing and new native hedging and new trees would be planted. With regards to lighting, this is not detailed in the application, however, considering the location of the site, on the edge of the village, it is considered appropriate to add a condition to any permission requiring details of lighting to be submitted to the LPA for approval before it is installed.

8.19 Subject to a condition relating to lighting, it is considered that the proposed development would comply with the guidance set out in the Broughton VDS.

8.20 **Heritage**

The site is adjacent to Broughton Conservation Area and to Hyde Farm House which is a Grade II listed building. In accordance with policy E9 of the RLP, the impact the proposed development would have on the settings of these heritage assets needs to be assessed.

8.21 Impact on the conservation area

The proposed development would introduce residential development on a site which is adjacent to the conservation area boundary. Whilst, as discussed in paragraphs 8. to 8. above the proposals are not considered to have an impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area as a whole, the conservation officer has concerns that the proposals would result in harm to the character of this part of the conservation area. The conservation officer is of the view that as a result of the combination of the design of houses proposed, along

with their layout, the proposed development is likely to *'prevent the development from integrating as well as it could into the locality'* and would result in the development *'being more akin to what would be expected to be found on a modern housing development, than a semi-rural location in an historic village'*. The conservation officer recognises however, that public views of the site are relatively limited and this, along with the amount of planting proposed, would minimise the impact on the setting of the adjacent conservation area resulting in a less-than-substantial harm on this heritage asset.

8.22 Impact on the setting of the listed building

In relation to the setting of the listed building, it is noted that the proposed development would result in the loss of part the setting of the listed building in that the proposals would be sited on what was originally farmland associated with Hyde Farm House. This land provides context to the understanding of the historic use of the listed building and building upon it, would make it harder to appreciate the historic use aspect of its special interest. Notwithstanding this, after the development is completed, Hyde Farm House would still sit within the remains of its historic group of buildings and some of its setting would remain to the east and to the south east. In addition, public views of the listed building would be largely unaltered with the public experience of the building and its setting being unchanged. As such, whilst the proposal would result in harm to the setting of the listed building, through the loss of some of its setting, this harm is considered to be less-than-substantial.

8.23 Impact on heritage assets and assessment in relation to policy E9 of the RLP

Policy E9 of the RLP sets out that where there is considered to be a less than substantial harm of the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm needs to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. In this instance it is considered that the provision of housing, the requirement for the payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy and landscape improvements (see paragraphs 8. to 8. above) would amount to economic, social and environmental benefits that would weigh significantly in favour of the scheme when set against the level of harm identified in the above paragraphs.

8.24 **Impact on residential amenity**

Impact on existing dwellings – South Road

Proposed plots 6-9 would be sited so that their rear elevation would be immediately opposite the front elevations of existing dwellings along South Road (Dunmoovan, Coombe Cottage, Lambourne and Trickledown View). As a result of the proposed separation between these plots and the existing dwellings (minimum distance approximately 30 metres between plot 7 and Lambourne), coupled with the difference in levels (the proposed dwellings would be at a lower level than the existing dwellings along South Road) and as a result of the screening that would be provided by proposed boundary treatment, it is considered that the proposals would not result in any adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of these neighbouring dwellings in terms of overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing or loss of light.

8.25 Impact on existing dwellings – Westwinds

Proposed plot 5 would be adjacent to an existing dwelling known as 'Westwinds' which is located to the south west of the site. It is considered that there would be adequate separation between the proposed dwelling at plot 5 itself and Westwinds (approximately 10 metres) so that there would be no adverse impacts in terms of overshadowing or overbearing. With regards to overlooking, plot 5 would not include any windows at first floor level on its side elevation which would face out onto Westwinds. As a result, it is not considered that the proposals would result in any adverse overlooking into this neighbouring property.

8.26 The proposed shared garage/car port between plots 5 and 6 would be directly adjacent the boundary between plot 5 and Westwinds. As a result of the single storey nature of the garage/car port and as the adjacent part of Westwinds is a small part of the garden (the main part of the garden is located to the south), it is not considered that this element of the proposals would result in any adverse impacts on the amenities of the occupiers of Westwinds in terms of overbearing, overshadowing or loss of light.

8.27 Impact on existing dwellings – Jennifers Barn

Jennifers Barn is located to the north of the site, adjacent to proposed plot 9. Due to the separation between plot 9 and this neighbouring dwelling (approximately 6.8 metres between side elevations), it is not considered that the proposals would result in any adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of this existing dwelling.

8.28 Impact on proposed dwellings – South Road

As discussed at paragraph 8. the proposed dwellings would be set at a lower level than the existing dwellings along South Road. Due to the separation between the dwellings and as a result of the screening that would be provided by the proposed boundary treatment, it is considered that there would be no adverse impacts on the proposed dwellings from existing dwellings in terms of overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing or loss of light.

8.29 Impact on proposed dwellings on each other

The submitted layout shows that the relationships between the properties including proposed separation distances would be adequate such that the dwellings would not have any adverse impacts in terms of overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing or loss of light on each other.

8.30 Residential amenity summary

As a result of the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any adverse impacts on neighbour amenity in terms of overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing or loss of light. The proposals therefore comply with policy LHW4 of the RLP.

8.31 Highways and Rights of Way

The proposed development would utilise the existing access off Horsebridge Road which is to be modified to provide a carriageway width of 5.5 metres leading into the site (reducing to 4.8 metres within the site). The existing visibility provided by the access is considered to be adequate to facilitate the proposed development without there being any harm to highway safety.

8.32 The proposed development would provide parking in accordance with the parking standards set out at Annex G to the RLP including the provision of visitor parking. The highway officer previously raised concerns in relation to the convenience of the parking associated with Plot 1 and the likelihood of the layout encouraging the occupiers of this property to park their vehicles so that it obstructs the access road to the other plots. In response to this, the applicant has amended the plans to show a wall to the front of Plot 1 which would prevent parking to the front of the property. The plans also now show a pathway from the parking to the front door. An additional external door is also provided close to the parking to provide more convenient access to the house from the parking area. As a result, it is considered that the proposed parking for plot 1 would now be more convenient for the occupiers of this dwelling than parking on the access road. Obstruction of the access is therefore prevented.

8.33 There are a number of third party concerns in relation to the increase in traffic using Horsebridge Road as a result of the development and the impact this would have on highway safety. The highways officer has previously confirmed that they have no concerns in relation to this as '*...the amount of traffic likely to be generated will be very low*'. Notwithstanding this, the applicant has submitted further information in relation to specific comments raised by third parties which are discussed further below.

8.34 *Increased traffic*

In the submitted transport statement TRICS data has been used to estimate likely trip generation from the development. TRICS is an industry accepted system to estimate trip rates. For this development, the TRICS data indicates that the development would generate circa 6 additional two-way trips in both the AM and PM peak commute hours. This equates to 1 trip every 10 minutes in the peak periods. It is not considered that this additional level of traffic in peak periods would result in a material impact on the surrounding highways. Vehicle trip generation would be less outside of the peak periods.

8.35 *Narrow Roads*

Some concerns were raised in relation to the narrow roads in the vicinity of the site. Horsebridge Road varies in width between 4.3 and 5 metres. This width is sufficient for two cars to pass one another and for a car to pass pedestrians walking along the road safely. It is not considered that the use of these roads, for the amount of trips likely to be generated by the proposed development, would result in any adverse impacts to highway safety.

8.36 Lack of footway

It is noted that there is no footway along the stretch of Horsebridge Road immediately adjacent to the site for approximately 425m after which there is a 1 metre wide footway which leads into the centre of the village. The applicant, in response to the third party comments has recorded a snap shot survey of vehicles travelling along Horsebridge Road and compared this with Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data along with TRICS data for pedestrian movements (using sub-urban sites, which will generate more walking trips than rural sites). The outcome of this is as follows:

- Number of vehicle movements recorded travelling along Horsebridge Road is low. 10 two-way trips were observed in one hour between 1100hrs and 1200 hrs on 29 August 2018.
- A review of the latest 5 year Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data indicates that there have been no reported accidents along Horsebridge Road.
- A review of multi modal TRICS data estimates that a development of 9 dwellings would generate circa 16 daily one way walk trips (equivalent to 8 two way trips assuming that a person leaves the house by foot and returns by the same mode). This equates to an average of some 1.25 trips per hour over a 12 hour period (0700-1900hrs).

As a result of the above, given the low number of pedestrian movements expected against the low vehicle numbers travelling along Horsebridge Road, the applicant has concluded that the potential conflict between pedestrian and vehicles' will be negligible. The additional comments received from the applicant have been forwarded onto the highway officer for further comment, however, their response had not been received at the time of writing this report. Any further comments from the highway officer will be recorded in the update paper.

8.37 Notwithstanding the comments from the applicant in relation to the lack of a footway along Horsebridge Road, there is an alternative route into the centre of the village should occupiers of the proposed dwellings not want to walk along Horsebridge Road. The adjacent Public Right of Way (PROW) which runs from the rear of the site along field boundaries parallel to Horsebridge Road could also be used to gain access to the village centre.

8.38 In response to the potential increased use of the PROW to access the centre of the village and its facilities by occupiers of the proposed development, the rights of way officer at Hampshire County Council has requested a financial contribution towards improvements to the PROW. Such improvements would include the upgrading of the route to accommodate cycles and the dedication of bridleway rights. The contribution would be secured through the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement. In accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL Regulations) and NPPF, legal agreements should only be sought where they meet the following tests:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- b) directly related to the development; and
- c) fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.

In this instance, the PROW provides alternative access to village amenities. Occupiers of the development would be likely to use the PROW to walk to the village instead of walking along Horsebridge Road. The contribution is therefore considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and is directly related to the development. In relation to point c), the rights of way officer has detailed the costs in relation to their charging schedule. As a result, the officer recommendation to Members includes the requirement for a contribution towards the PROW to be secured through the completion of a legal agreement.

8.39 Highway summary

The proposed access to the site would provide adequate visibility. The amount and layout of the parking to be provided within the site is in accordance with the parking standards set out at Annex G to the RLP. It is also considered that the proposals would not result in an increase in traffic on the surrounding highway network that would result in an adverse impact on highway safety. The proposals are therefore considered to comply with policies T1 and T2 of the RLP.

8.40 **Water, drainage and flood risk**

Flooding

The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in support of the application. The FRA has assessed flood risk issues relating to the site from a number of sources. These are summarised as follows.

8.41 Fluvial Sources

The site is situated in Flood Zone 1 as defined by the flood maps produced by the Environment Agency. The site is therefore at least risk of flooding. The FRA confirms that the site is approximately 50 metres from Wallop Brook, a tributary of the River Test. The Council's Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) records that the River Test and its tributaries are not susceptible to flooding, as the chalk bedrock has a buffering effect on river flows. As a result, it is not considered that fluvial flood risk is a material consideration in the determination of this planning application.

8.42 Surface water flooding (pluvial/overland flow)

The FRA states that part of the southernmost part of the site is at low risk from ground water flooding and that mapping from the Environment Agency indicates that Horsebridge Road may be prone to ponding of surface water. Comments from third parties have shown that Horsebridge Road does indeed flood. In relation to Horsebridge Road, the FRA states that flooding is likely to be a combination of ponding of surface water runoff generated within Horsebridge Road and the existing site, and insufficient capacity in the adjacent roadside ditch. The ditch capacity can be reduced by a number of factors including eroded material from highway grips (a shallow ditch connecting the road edge to the roadside ditch), blocked gullies or a lack of maintenance.

8.43 In relation to the proposed development itself, the FRA explains that as Horsebridge Road is situated at a lower elevation relative to the site, any pooling floodwaters in the road would be unlikely to impact upon the proposed development. With regards to the impact the proposed development would have on the existing situation on Horsebridge Road, the FRA indicates that the development will reduce flood risk to the highway through the introduction of a sustainable drainage system that will capture runoff and prevent it from discharging as groundwater runoff onto the road. The applicant contends that this would be a betterment compared to the existing situation.

8.44 Groundwater flooding

The FRA states that Broughton is within the Environment Agency's groundwater flood warning area, being affected by groundwater flooding every 10 to 15 years. The applicant has undertaken a ground investigation of the site where no groundwater was encountered. The ground investigation comprised the excavation of four trial pits to 3 metre depth. As such, the FRA considers that groundwater flood risk would be low-moderate. To mitigate this risk, the FRA states that finished floor levels should be set 150mm above surrounding ground levels.

8.45 The information submitted in the FRA satisfactorily demonstrates that the proposals would not increase the risk of flooding both within the site itself and elsewhere. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy E7 of the RLP. The Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted on the amended proposals and have raised no objections.

8.46 **Ecology**

Bats

The application is supported by an ecology survey report (Lindsey Carrington Ecological Services Ltd, November 2017, updated March and September 2018). The report notes that no evidence of bats was found during the visual inspection. One of the buildings on the site was assessed as presenting low roost potential and therefore a single evening visit was carried out to confirm the findings of the visual inspection. No bats were seen to emerge from or return to the building during the emergence survey. In view of these findings, the Council's ecologist is of the view that the development is unlikely to result in harm to bats. It is recommended that an informative note be added to any permission informing the developer of their responsibilities in relation to bats and their roosts during the development.

Notwithstanding the above, Broughton has a rich bat population and as such, linear vegetation/boundary features on the edge of the settlement can be important flight lines for bats dispersing between their roost sites in the village and foraging areas in the surrounding landscape. As such, it is recommended that any permission include a condition requiring the applicant to submit a lighting strategy to the LPA for approval. This will ensure that any external lighting would not adversely affect bat flight lines.

8.47 Swallows

The ecology report identified the presence of Swallow nests in the existing stable building. The proposed development will therefore result in the loss of nesting opportunities for this species. Whilst the ecology report makes some general recommendations to address this loss in terms of the overall bid assemblage, there are no specific recommendations to address impacts to this species that have been set out as deliverable. The Council's ecologist would welcome some further consideration of this species with one option being to explore if there are other opportunities on areas around the site within the applicant's ownership that could accommodate some artificial swallow nest cups. This is being discussed with the applicant and an update will be provided to Members at the SAPC meeting.

8.48 General biodiversity considerations

The Council's ecologist is satisfied that overall, the proposal presents opportunities for biodiversity gains. Broughton is an important area for bats, and as such, a more coherent scheme here is required. The proposed construction of the buildings presents a range of opportunities such as the inclusion of timber-clad elements, or incorporating simple features in the loft areas of some of the garages. As a result, it is recommended that a condition be added to any permission requiring details of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

9.0 **CONCLUSION**

9.1 The site is located within Broughton Settlement Boundary and as such, residential development on the site is considered acceptable in principle subject to the proposals complying with the other relevant policies contained within the RLP. In this instance it is not considered that the proposals would have any adverse impact on the economy, affordable housing, the character and appearance of the surrounding area, residential amenity, highways, ecology or flooding. It is noted that the proposals would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the conservation area and adjacent listed building, however, this harm is considered to be significantly outweighed by the public benefits of the proposals.

9.2 As a result of the above, the proposals are considered to comply with the relevant policies contained within the RLP and as a result, permission is recommended.

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

Delegate to the Head of Planning and Building subject to:

- **Completion of a legal agreement to secure financial contributions towards:**
 - **Affordable Housing provision**
 - **Improvement of adjacent Public Right of Way**
- **Submission of amended plans which show:**
 - **Replacement of Oak trees proposed on the south east boundary of the site with Lime trees; and**
 - **Replacement of middle Acer Freemanii proposed within the site with a London Plane.**

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. Notwithstanding the submitted details no development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of all external surfaces hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure the development has a satisfactory external appearance in the interest of visual amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.
3. Soft landscaping works shall be undertaken in full accordance with the 'Hyde Farm Broughton. Hants. Landscape Masterplan', Issue (to be confirmed after submission of amended plans).
Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.
4. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until full details of hard landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports). Implementation and maintenance details shall also be included. The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1 and E2.
5. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in full accordance with the provisions set out within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (SJ Stephens Associates, Project number 805, report date 16 August 2018).
Reason: To ensure the enhancement of the development by the retention of existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.

- 6. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until a detailed biodiversity mitigation and enhancement strategy that includes (but is not limited to) specifications, locations of and management of features for nesting birds, roosting and foraging bats, and botanical/habitat interests has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the new dwellings.
Reason: To enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and Policy E5 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 7. Details of any external lighting proposed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the installation of such lighting. The lighting scheme should demonstrate that existing boundary vegetation will remain unilluminated by new lighting. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To avoid impacts to bat commuting and foraging activity and to improve the appearance of the site and enhance the character of the development in the interest of visual amenity and contribute to the character of the local area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policies E1, E2 and E5.**
- 8. 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 plan and this space shall thereafter be reserved for such purposes at all times.
Reason: In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.**
- 9. The development hereby approved shall be designed and built to meet Regulation 36 2 (b) requirement of 110 litres/person/day water efficiency set out in part G2 of Building Regulations 2015.
Reason: In the interests of improving water usage efficiency in accordance with policy E7 of the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016.**
- 10. No development shall take place above DPC level of the development hereby permitted until full details of all new windows and doors have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The windows and doors shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To protect the character and appearance of the building and setting of adjacent conservation area in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E9.**
- 11. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers:
TBC upon submission of amended plans
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**

Notes to applicant:

- 1. In reaching this decision Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC) has had regard to paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. TVBC work with applicants and their agents in a positive and proactive manner offering a pre-application advice service and updating applicants/agents of issues that may arise in dealing with the application and where possible suggesting solutions.**
 - 2. Bats and their roosts receive strict legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. All work must stop immediately if bats, or evidence of bat presence (e.g. droppings, bat carcasses or insect remains), are encountered at any point during this development. Should this occur, further advice should be sought from Natural England and/or a professional ecologist.**
-