



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2018

by Robert Mellor BSc DipTRP DipDesBEnv DMS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/C1760/W/17/3179932

Land west of Cupernham Lane, Romsey, Hants SO51 7LE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Southcott Homes (Fareham) Ltd against the decision of Test Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01857/FULLS, dated 2 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 21 dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of 21 dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping on land west of Cupernham Lane, Romsey, Hants SO51 7LE in accordance with the terms of the application, 16/01857/FULLS, dated 2 August 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. Planning permission was refused for 7 reasons. The Appellant subsequently submitted a signed S106 Unilateral Undertaking to provide affordable housing and to make a financial contribution as mitigation for potential impacts on the New Forest Special Protection Area. I am satisfied that the S106 Undertaking suitably addresses the relevant issues. The Appellant has also submitted further ecological information with which the Council is satisfied overcomes the relevant reason for refusal subject to a landscaping condition that would amongst other things permit adjustments for the conservation of Great Crested Newts. In consequence the Council is not pursuing 3 of the refusal reasons. The Council also agrees that a fourth reason relating to tree protection associated with construction of the access road can also be satisfactorily addressed by condition.
3. I therefore consider the main outstanding issues to be: the principle of the proposed development having regard to its location outside the settlement boundary as defined in the development plan; the effect on the character and appearance of the area; the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents in respect of privacy; and whether any material considerations would outweigh any conflict with the development plan.

Policy Context

4. Statute requires that the appeal shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan here includes the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD 2011-2029 (2016) (the RLP). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Planning History

5. Since the subject application was determined the Appellants have submitted another planning application for the same site but which would provide only 10 dwellings, none of which would be affordable. That application (Ref 17/02563/FULLS) was considered by the relevant Council committee on 20 February 2018 when the officer report recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions but a decision has been deferred to 13 March 2018 to allow members to visit the site.
6. I am advised that there have been other applications in the past to develop the site including an application in 1978 for a single dwelling. These would have been made when policies and circumstances were different and they do not bear on the current appeal.

Reasons

Principle of Development

7. It is not disputed that the proposed development would contravene RLP Policy COM2 in that it lies adjacent to but outside the settlement boundary and is therefore within the countryside for policy purposes. As such it is neither development which that policy defines as appropriate in the countryside, nor is it essential for the development to be located in the countryside.
8. It is also undisputed that the Council is able to demonstrate that it has in excess of the 5 year supply of housing land which the Framework seeks as minimum provision if housing supply policies in the development plan are to be considered up to date and meriting of full weight. The tilted balance and presumption in favour of development set out in paragraph 14 of the Framework does not apply in this case. That did not necessarily apply when all the other housing developments were permitted nearby including those that pre-dated the adoption of the RLP.
9. The Appellant has drawn parallels between the circumstances of this case and those of a recent appeal decision elsewhere at Abbotsford, Braishfield Road, Romsey¹. That appeal decision has also been referred to in the officer's report to the Council committee on 20 February 2018. In that decision the Inspector noted that the aim of Policy COM2 is to direct development to the most sustainable locations and in so doing to reconcile the need for development with the need to protect the countryside. I agree. The Abbotsford scheme was mainly located outside the settlement boundary. The Inspector nevertheless concluded that other material considerations in that case outweighed that conflict with the development plan.

¹ Appeal Ref APP/C1760/W/17/3170081- Decision dated 24 November 2017

10. I conclude on this issue that in this case, as in the Abbotsford appeal, there is an in-principle conflict between the proposed development and Policy COM2. However, before determining the appeal it is necessary to consider what if any other harm would be caused by the development and whether, as at Abbotsford, there are any material considerations that may outweigh that conflict with the development plan.

Character and Appearance

11. RLP Policy E1 seeks amongst other things that development should integrate, respect and complement the character of the area and that it should make efficient use of the land whilst respecting the character of the surrounding area and neighbouring uses.
12. RLP Policy E2 seeks amongst other things that development does not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the immediate area and the landscape character of the area within which it is located. It also seeks to avoid the loss of important local features such as trees and hedges and that existing and proposed landscaping enable the development to be positively integrated into the area's landscape character.
13. The frontage of the appeal site along Cupernham Lane is occupied by groups of attractive mature deciduous trees and woodland that is subject to group or woodland Tree Preservation Orders. That protection also applies to mature trees that overhang the site from within the garden of the adjoining property to the north (Ringstead). The appeal proposal seeks to retain the protected trees that are the site's most important landscape feature and which dominate views along the lane.
14. The land falls away sharply from Cupernham Lane before levelling out. The lower ground has apparently been used for grazing. The site is enclosed on its western side by a field hedgerow which would be removed. That hedge also includes 2 isolated protected trees that are to be retained.
15. The houses would generally be sited on the lower ground on the western half of the site. 11 of the houses would back on to the western boundary. The layout also includes 6 north-facing semi-detached houses along the southern boundary and 4 south-facing detached houses along the northern boundary.
16. In the Abbotsford appeal the Inspector found that the development would have been divided from the countryside by the large Ganger Farm development. In the present case the Oxlease housing development now under construction outside the settlement boundary separates the appeal site from the countryside to the west. To the south the appeal site adjoins the settlement boundary and permission has recently been granted for housing development outside the settlement boundary at Granton beyond the adjacent older housing (Ref 17/00082/FULLS).
17. To the north the modest area of immediately adjoining land is designated as countryside but is occupied by long-established low-density built development. Beyond that land a series of permitted housing developments on both sides of Cupernham lane are also outside the settlement boundary and they isolate the area around the appeal site from the wider countryside.
18. On the opposite east side of Cupernham Lane from the appeal site is a large area of open space and nature reserve. That land lies outside the settlement

boundary but is itself isolated from the wider countryside by extensive new housing developments. I understand that it is land to be safeguarded as open space in association with adjoining housing development to the east and is thus likely to remain open whether or not it remains outside the settlement boundary in the longer term. That land is fronted by woodland along Cupernham Lane of similar character to that to be retained on the frontage of the appeal site.

19. It would be for a future boundary review to determine whether the settlement boundary should be altered, as the Inspector acknowledged in his report on the Local Plan. In the meantime numerous planning permissions have been granted for development in the surrounding area which have left the appeal site in an anomalous and isolated position as a pocket of open land in an increasingly developed suburban area.
20. After all permitted housing developments in the area have been implemented Cupernham Lane will only retain its original character over a short distance where it passes between areas of open land on both sides with woodland along their frontages. However, even there the rural character has already been eroded by the construction of a kerbed footway and by the impact of the Oxlease development on middle distance views from Cupernham Lane. Filtered short distance views remain from the Lane into the appeal site and there are also still long distance views of the countryside over the roofs of the Oxlease houses.
21. Woodland would be retained on either side of the access road along the site frontage and there would be new tree planting within the site. The houses would be set back from Cupernham Lane at a lower level and would be seen against a backdrop of the large houses on the Oxlease site. There are currently no open views between the large and closely-spaced Oxlease houses and thus a reduced density of development on the appeal site to create gaps would only provide views of other housing beyond. The appeal development would not affect distant views of the countryside beyond that would survive over the roofs of the houses on both developments.
22. The appeal site is also seen at present from the track which runs between the Oxlease development and the appeal site and which is being developed as a footpath in association with the Oxlease development. From that track the proposed development would replace an open view of the hedge, field and woodland with a less attractive and less open view of a high garden fence with some associated visual harm. The straight track would acquire a more formal and suburban character.
23. Planning permission was refused in part because the density was considered to be too high. By most standards the gross density of the development at 15 dwellings per hectare (dph) would be low. However the need to retain the protected trees and to accommodate the change in levels across the site means that net density at about 23dph would be higher. On that basis the development would make suitably efficient use of the land as required by Policy E1(d) and the density would not be excessive.
24. In relation to Policy E1(a) the design and layout including density would be appropriate and would respect the changing character of the surrounding area. The effect of the development would be to partially urbanise this open rural land. Within the site and in views from the adjacent track and from

Cupernham Lane there would be a loss of rural landscape character and an associated partial conflict with RLP Policy E2. However whilst Policy E2 seeks integration with the existing landscape character, the appeal site is located within an area where previous decisions by the Council mean that the surrounding area is also changing inevitably from a rural character to that of a more suburban area as the town expands. The most important surviving landscape features are the areas of woodland on both sides of Cupernham Lane and the appeal proposal includes suitable protection of that feature on the appeal site.

Living Conditions

25. RLP Policy LHW4 seeks amongst other things that development provides for the privacy and amenity of its occupants and those of neighbouring properties.
26. Some overlooking is to be expected in a residential area. In that respect the proposed houses would be sufficiently far from the neighbouring Ringstead and the Oxlease houses and/or oriented in such a way that there would not be significant impacts there from mutual overlooking.
27. The adjacent dwelling to the south at No 69 Cupernham Lane previously adjoined open countryside on two sides and would not have been overlooked. However levels of privacy have already been reduced because the rear garden in particular is overlooked from the first floor of the recently constructed houses on the Oxlease development. I would expect that the rear garden area close to the latter development would be the most used area for sitting out as it includes a swimming pool and would be the sunniest part of the garden.
28. I understand that the side garden on the north side of No 69 is an area of land that has recently been acquired from the Appellant to provide additional garden. The rear gardens of the two-storey houses proposed along the southern boundary of the appeal scheme would adjoin that side garden. They would be about 20m-20.5m at the closest from the flank elevation of No 69 which includes 2 small bedroom windows and larger ground floor windows to a habitable room which I understand to be a kitchen.
29. The RLP does not define measurable objectives in relation to privacy and I have not been advised that the Council operates any minimum separation distances or that it has any published guidance on this matter. However from my experience 20m separation is about the minimum separation distance sought by some local planning authorities whilst others seek minimum distances of up to about 22m for two storey development. In this case I consider that 20m separation would provide acceptable minimum separation between windows, albeit with a reduction in previous high levels of privacy. There would also be the possibility of overlooking into the side garden of No 69. However it is worth considering whether the effects are capable of mitigation.
30. The Appellant has suggested that a 1.8m close boarded fence with 0.4m trellis on top would be planted together with a hedge that would grow to a height of 2.4m. However I do not consider that these measures would be effective in fully screening views between the properties. Sheds are proposed adjacent to that boundary of the new houses which would impede hedge planting. Moreover it would be difficult or impossible to manage how such a hedge is maintained when it is in private ownership and control. A high hedge would take up space in these small gardens and result in the loss of southern

sunlight. In any case a 2.4m high boundary would not provide effective screening between the first floor windows.

31. The small gardens of the proposed dwellings would at 10m-10.5m be too short to allow significant screen tree planting within those gardens, particularly as about half of the width of the gardens would be occupied by an outbuilding. Screen tree planting within the gardens would also cause shading that would reduce the amenity value of the gardens.
32. Nevertheless there is scope for the neighbouring occupier at No 69 to enhance privacy at their own property if they seek to achieve a higher standard of privacy. A new fence topped with partial trellis on that boundary has already been erected by the occupier and there is space for additional screen planting within the garden. Blinds or net curtains are commonly used to enhance privacy within rooms.
33. My overall conclusion on this issue is that the short rear gardens would result in some actual and perceived loss of privacy at No 69 due to overlooking and there would be literal conflict with RLP Policy LHW4 which could not be fully mitigated by the developer and would need to be weighed with any benefits of the development.

Conditions

34. The Council has suggested conditions to be applied in the event that the appeal is allowed. I agree that these are needed for the reasons set out in the schedule subject to some wording changes in the interests of clarity, consistency and enforceability. The conditions suggested by the Council however omit those requested by the highways consultee and which resemble those included on the recommendation to permit the subsequent 10 dwelling scheme. I have therefore added those conditions in the interests of highway safety.

Other Matters

35. I have taken into account all other matters raised in representations. In particular I am aware that the neighbour who occupies the dwelling known as Ringstead to the north of the site is concerned about the implications for the protected trees on their land where they would overhang land within the rear gardens of houses along the northern boundary. However those trees would be far enough from the buildings that they are unlikely to be affected by the construction works. It is likely that new residential occupiers would seek permission to carry out works to remove some of the low hanging branches. However because of the tree preservation order that would require the consent of the Council. I do not consider that extensive works would be needed that would significantly affect the amenity value of the trees. The gardens beneath the trees would not be excessively shaded as they would receive sunshine from the south. Neither that nor the other matters raised outweigh my overall conclusions.

Planning Balance and Conclusions

36. In the Abbotsford appeal the Inspector only identified a conflict with RLP Policy COM2. In this appeal I have identified that there would be in principle conflict with RLP Policy COM2, and partial conflicts with Policies E2 and LHW4. There would thus be an overall conflict with the development plan.

37. In terms of benefits there would be some economic benefits from the development through employment during construction and from increased local spending. Contributions for infrastructure and towards the New Forest would be mitigation for the impacts of the development rather than net benefits.
38. As a significant social benefit the appeal proposal would provide 8 affordable dwellings and a financial contribution in lieu of 0.4 of a dwelling in accordance with RLP Policy COM7. That benefit would not be realised were the number of dwellings to be reduced to below the policy threshold for the inclusion of affordable housing, as is proposed in the subsequent application.
39. The development would also contribute additional market housing. There is a widely reported national shortage of housing and the Council has acknowledged that national and local policy do not seek to cap housing numbers even where, as here, the Council can demonstrate a 5 year housing supply. Moreover development at the proposed density would make suitably efficient use of the land which a low density development may not.
40. I attach some weight to the environmental benefit of the proposed tree planting within the site to weigh against the removal of a long field hedge and other negative impacts on the landscape character through built development of open greenfield land. However, whilst there would be a partial loss of openness, the area surrounding the appeal site is under development and is ceasing to demonstrate a rural countryside character.
41. The appeal site itself is becoming isolated from the countryside and is too small to retain or reinforce that rural character on its own when it already borders built development on three sides. Its main positive landscape feature is the frontage woodland which will be retained and will continue to have a positive landscape impact in views from Cupernham Lane in association with woodland on the opposite side of the road.
42. The appeal site is located adjacent to the settlement boundary where there is suitable access to services and facilities by sustainable means of travel.
43. My overall conclusion is that the benefits of the development and especially the inclusion of affordable housing in a development that makes efficient use of the site are important material considerations that here outweigh the identified harms and the conflict with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

Robert Mellor

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
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, numbered: 1114-PD-101 Rev D; 1114-SK-102 Rev D; 1114PD112; 1114-PD-101 Rev A; 1114PD110; 1114PD111; 1114PD113; 1114PD114; 1114PD115; and 1114PD120 Rev A.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3) No development shall take place above damp proof course 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.
- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions set out within the Addendum Arboricultural Impact Assessment reference 15656 dated 12th June 2017 no development shall take place until an updated arboricultural method statement reflecting the protection of trees during construction of the access road has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
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.
- 5) Tree protective measures installed (in accordance with the tree protection condition) shall be maintained and retained for the full duration of works or until such time as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No activities, nor material storage, nor placement of site huts or other equipment what-so-ever shall take place within the barrier.
Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 6) All service routes, drain runs, soakaways or excavations in connection with the development hereby permitted shall remain wholly outside the tree protective barrier.
Reason: To ensure the avoidance of damage to existing trees and natural features during the construction phase in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E2.
- 7) No development shall take place above damp proof course level of the development hereby permitted until full details of hard and soft landscape works ,a programme for their implementation, and a management plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Details shall include-where appropriate: proposed finished levels or contours;

means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting, etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.

The landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the implementation programme and in accordance with the management plan.

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.

- 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 Local Plan 2016.

- 10) There shall be no construction or demolition works, no machinery shall be operated, no processes carried out and no deliveries received or dispatched outside the following times: 07:30 to 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturday. In addition, no such activities shall take place on Sundays, Bank or Public holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan policies E8 and LWH4.

- 11) No development shall commence until detailed proposals for the sustainable disposal of foul and surface water and any trade effluent have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed details shall be fully implemented before the first occupation of the dwellings.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and in the interest of local amenities in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan 2016 policy E7.

- 12) No development shall commence until full details of the layout for the parking and manoeuvring onsite of contractor's and delivery vehicles during the construction period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to

the commencement of development and retained for the duration of the construction period.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan 2016 policy T1.

- 13) Development shall proceed in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in Sections 5.3 (Great Crested Newts) and 5.4 (Reptiles) of the Phase 2 Ecology Report Land West of Cupernham Lane Romsey Hampshire SO51 7LE (Lindsey Carrington Ecological Services Ltd., September 2017) unless varied by a European Protected Species (EPS) licence issued by Natural England. Thereafter, the compensatory reptile and great crested newt habitat shall be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to ensure the favourable conservation status of great crested newts and to avoid impacts to reptiles in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 14) Prior to commencement, a detailed lighting scheme that demonstrates that the lighting will not adversely affect bat activity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to avoid adverse impacts to bats in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 15) No development shall commence until a detailed scheme for the enhancement of biodiversity interest at the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall subsequently proceed only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: to enhance the biodiversity interest of the site in accordance with Policy E5 of the Test Valley Revised Local Plan 2016.

- 16) No development shall commence until the developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological assessment in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) that has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority in order to recognise, characterise and record any archaeological features and deposits that may exist here. The assessment shall take the form of trial trenching, with trenches targeted upon the footprints of the proposed houses, garages and access road. If the results of the evaluation are deemed significant enough by Test Valley Borough Council, then a programme of archaeological mitigation of impact, based on the results of the trial trenching, shall be carried out in accordance with a further Written Scheme of Investigation that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following the completion of all archaeological fieldwork, a report shall be produced in accordance with an approved programme including, where appropriate, a post-excavation assessment consisting of specialist analysis and reports together with a programme of publication and public engagement.

Reason: In the interest of the heritage of the site in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan policy E9.

- 17) No development shall commence until details, including plans and cross sections, of the existing and proposed ground levels of the development and the boundaries of the site and the height of the ground floor slab and damp

proof course in relation thereto have been 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 Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy E1.

- 18) No development shall commence unless or until an Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Environmental Management Plan shall cover the control of noise and dust during the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of development. Work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Environmental Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Test Valley Borough Local Plan policies E8 and LWH4.

- 19) No development shall commence until a detailed design of the bellmouth and proposed footway along Cupernham Lane has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and completed prior to the occupation of the first dwelling,

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

- 20) No development shall commence until the access has been constructed with the visibility splays of 2.4 by 120 metres which shall thereafter be retained. Within these visibility splays notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) no obstacles, including walls, fences and vegetation, shall exceed the height of 1 metres above the level of the existing carriageway at any time.

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

- 21) No development above DPC level of the proposal hereby permitted shall take place until, details of the measures to be taken to physically and permanently close the existing access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The existing access shall be closed upon first use of the new access and before occupation of the first dwelling, and, notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no access other than that shown on the approved plan shall be formed.

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

- 22) The gradient of the drive shall not exceed 5% within 20 metres of the edge of the carriageway of the adjoining highway.

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

- 23) At least the first 20 metres of the access track measured from the nearside edge of carriageway of the adjacent highway shall be surfaced in a non-

migratory material prior to the use of the access commencing and retained as such at all times.

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

- 24) No development above damp proof course level of the first unit to be constructed shall commence until the Local Planning Authority shall have approved in writing a Quality Audit incorporating a Stage 1 Safety Audit, as recommended in Manual for Streets published by the Chartered Institute for Highways and Transportation. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Safety Audit.

Reason: To ensure that the highways works are provided to an appropriate standard to serve the development in accordance with Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan (2016) Policy T1.