REF. NO. O/16/77848

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Outline: Application for construction of 1no. 2 bed dwelling with access off Baltic Road (access, layout & scale to be considered) Rear of 45 Hope Road West End Southampton SO30 3GE

SITE VISIT - Yes

ARE PLANS ACCURATE? - Yes

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED? - Yes

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal seeks outline permission for the erection of a two bed chalet style bungalow with front and rear dormer window. There are two tandem car parking spaces at the front and a garden to the rear.
SITE AREA	347m2
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	28.8 dwellings per hectare
TOPOGRAPHY	Behind the dwelling the land gently slopes down where it dips in the centre of the plot and then slopes up towards the end.
TREES	Although there are a number of trees along and around the site boundaries only the trees positioned between Glenwood and 2 Old School Gardens are covered by Blanket Tree Preservation Order (Order 96). The TPO order is around 8m distance from the edge of the site.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mixture of close boarded fencing and vegetation along three sides of the site boundaries. The fencing is lower alongside no.47 so there are views across from the neighbouring property into the application site.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site forms part of the rear garden of no. 45, which is a semi detached bungalow. There is no boundary between the existing property and the proposed site.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential area, of similar style bungalows fronting Hope Road.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/27984	Outline: Erection of bungalow *Rear of 43 & 45 Hope Road*	Permit (May 1985)
Z/27984/001	Erection of one pair of semi-detached bungalows *Rear of 43 & 45 Hope Road*	Refused (Jan 1985)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

REF. NO. O/16/77848

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
letter of objection (Barton)	The proposed development would constitute an undesirable and over-intensive use of the site and would have an adverse effect on the amenities of residents of nearby properties. The character of the road would be eroded by the introduction of the 2 storey building and it's parking, reducing the visual amenity of Baltic Road. <u>Impact on Barton</u> 1. Loss of privacy to my lounge bay window. 2. Changing the aspect from country side garden setting to car park. 3. The building would overlook my property causing loss of privacy to my gardens. 4. Loss of light to my side window, meaning loss of light to a habitable room and the adjoining hallway. 5. Noise from cars and visitors outside my lounge and bedroom windows. 6. Access to the development would require the removal of trees which currently provide privacy from "Glenwood" opposite. 7. Should development be approved this would set a precedent for further undesirable building in neighbouring gardens. <u>Highways and Parking</u> 1. I would query the applicant's right to vehicular access over an un-adopted private road. 2. There are 3 protected Oak trees, meaning that the driveway entrance will be closer to my own boundary. This would cause vehicles exiting the proposed site to approach my own driveway from a blind spot. 3. To avoid blocking entrance to proposed development, parking would be unavailable outside my own frontage. This would create problems further up Baltic Road. Baltic Road is a short, un-adopted cul-de-sac of 6 bungalows, the street scene displays uniformity of spaces and buildings dominated by the bungalow form. Three properties on the proposed side have been refused permission for front alterations, to protect the visual amenity for residents.

REF. NO. O/16/77848

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
letter of objection (Glenwood)	In the "application for outline planning permission with some matters reserved town and country planning act 1990" section 6 is flawed; 1. The proposed access is NOT a public right of way. 2. The northern section is private and to be perfectly clear there is no possibility of access being granted. 3. The northern section is NOT a public highway. For confirmation and clarity of this, the justices made specific findings which were recorded. The case held at Eastleigh Magistrates Court on 1st November 1991 refers. 4. Furthermore, a meeting of the parish council on the 12th June 1991 stated that "councillor Kyrle had taken up the matter with officers at Eastleigh which also clearly states the northern end of Baltic Road is NOT a public highway. For clarity the meeting minutes will confirm. 5. Should the council grant permission, it would mean shared access from 45 Hope Road, indeed 49 Hope Road has a larger plot and this could well set some president for back land development. 6. The proposed layout would give rise to a relationship between the protected trees (see TPO's plan) and external amenity area that would be considered to be both cramped and oppressive, such as to result in a poor outlook from habitable accommodation, poorly lit, heavily shaded and uninviting front garden. This impact would be considered to give rise to pressures to prune the canopies of the protected trees and thereby undermine the amenity value of the trees, and their subsequent contribution to the appearance and character of the area. 7. The proposed layout for the car parking could give rise to significant root damage to the protected trees and also affect the crown compounded by loss of natural water drainage to the root system presenting a loss of the protected trees and amenity value. 8. The proposed development by reason of its size, depth, width, height and massing would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of the properties immediately adjacent to the site and the surrounding area by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and visually overbearing impact. In particular 43 and 47 Hope Road. Your attention is drawn to the human rights act protocol 1, article 1 which clearly states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions including their home and land. 9. The proposed development by reason of its scale, bulk and design would have a adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area as a whole and would encourage further back land development, representing an unneighbourly form of development. Detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining residential properties. This fragmented form of development would be totally unacceptable. 10. The proposed car parking is cramped with insufficient space to turn creating an unacceptable hazard for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles when exiting. 11. The land to the north of Baltic Road is known to be boggy, this problem is recurring caused by the leaves falling from Telegraph Wood. When it rains, the volume of leaves block the road drains, this in turn causes the water to flow down Telegraph Road and into Baltic Road. The proposed development site is the lowest area, making the soil unstable. Any excavation work due to the close proximity of the existing building "Barton" which is less than 1.0 metre to the proposed development could have a serious impact upon the stability of existing structures. The council have previously issued sand bags to properties to the west side of Baltic Road to assist in protecting them from flooding.

REF. NO. O/16/77848

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
letter of objection (Hope Dene)	We would oppose this application as it stands on the grounds of the proposed access through Baltic Road. Baltic Road is a private, un adopted road and clearly marked as a cul-de-sac at the top where it joins the main Road. The road surface is not in good condition and would certainly not tolerate any further wear. As we understand it the part of Baltic Road in question has been the subject of previous investigation through the courts and it was then established that it did indeed belong to the residents. We would respectfully suggest that the owners of 45 Hope Road arrange for access for any proposed new development to be through their own property.
letter of objection (Lyndale)	Baltic Road is a private unadopted road and I understood that all residents owned half of the road in front of their property, but could not prevent access to the other residents. In a court case in the early 1990s between the local authority and the owner of Glenwood, there was a ruling that the authority had no jurisdiction over the land at the bottom of Baltic Road adjoining the boundary of 45 Hope Road. In view of this I would assume that no access could be granted through Baltic Road without the consent of the existing residents. I would not wish to give my consent as this would limit parking for the existing residents and increase wear and tear on the road surface.
letter of objection (47 Hope Road)	We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposed development of an additional property in the rear garden of no 45 hope road west end, Our specific objections are as follows. <u>Loss of Privacy and Overlooking</u> • The proposed building would mean that our property would be severely overlooked from all the north facing windows [and west facing, if any] of both our property and garden with a consequence of a serious loss of our privacy. • In our opinion this development would be visually intrusive and an overdevelopment of the area. <u>Ground stability and drainage</u> • We have serious concerns about the impact that the proposed building could have on land that is already water logged for most of the year. • There is also a public sewer running within the boundary of both NO 47 and the proposed development at NO45. • There are also three very large oak trees on an adjacent boundary to the proposed development, which we believe may have a T.P.O. on them. • A stream is also located within a short distance of the proposed development.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
West End Parish Council	<u>Objection</u> on the grounds of insufficient information. Councillors would

REF. NO. O/16/77848

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	like more information on the access rights into Baltic Close as this is a private road.
Environmental Health	I have reviewed the information provided / that held by this Service and note the following: • The proposed development is located in the rear garden of 45 Hope Road. • There is limited access to the development site between 43 & 45 Hope Road. • Access to the finished development will be from Baltic Road. • Baltic Road is a private un-adopted dead end road which serves a small number of properties. • The new building is located within metres of the residential property called Barton Considering the above I wish to make the following comments: *This Service does not object to the principle of the proposed development. However, due to the sites proximity to the existing residential properties and the very restricted site access options, there is a high likelihood of the activities associated with the construction process, for example the deliveries to the site, impacting on the amenity of the existing residential properties.* Therefore I recommend the following conditions / advise: *The developer needs to demonstrate that they have considered the impacts of noise and dust on the existing residential properties and submit a detailed construction management plan that clearly identifies how these activities have been assessed and adapted to minimise the impact on the amenity of the existing properties. This document should not just focus on the physical construction processes but should also consider the location of temporary site buildings, compounds, construction material and plant storage areas; the arrangements for deliveries associated with all construction works including loading and unloading of plant and materials; the provision for storage, collection, and disposal of rubbish from the development; the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; and any temporary lighting.*
Ecology	<u>Protection of the River Itchen Special Conservation Area (SAC)</u> This site is within 5.5m of the Lower Itchen a significant tributary of the River Itchen. The Itchen is designated along its length under the European Union Habitats Directive. Within Eastleigh it has been established that there could be an in-combination impact on the Itchen from a number of developments if rigorous safeguards are not incorporated into all permission granted to preserve water quality and flows into the river. A Habitats Regulations Assessment is required for any minor application within 25m of a watercourse associated with the Itchen to ensure conformity with Regulation 61(1) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. The applicant is under an obligation to provide all information required for the Local Authority to undertake the assessment within Regulations 61(2)

REF. NO. O/16/77848

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	As this is outline permission impact can be alleviated providing further information regarding construction working practices and drainage within the operational phase is provided at the detailed stages. In relation to construction we request that a Construction Environment Management Plan is prepared before any work occurs on site to ensure no pollution into the stream and that water flows are maintained. In regards to onsite drainage we request that at least three forms of filtration are provided before discharge into the river. To ensure no impact on the SAC as a result of this development I recommend that the following conditions are attached to any permission granted. *Before any work commences on site, a detailed design and maintenance plan for Sustainable Urban Drainage will be submitted to and agreed by Eastleigh Borough Council. The SuDS should be as naturalised as possible and incorporate three forms of filtration.* ***Reason:** To ensure the preservation of water flows and water quality to the River Hamble* Within the construction process there is a possibility that contaminants and silt could enter the water system. To ensure safeguards are in place and surface water is not polluted, I recommend the following condition be attached to any permission granted:- *Before any work commences on site a Construction Environment Management Plan will be submitted to Eastleigh Borough Council incorporating safeguards to preserve the water quality and flows leaving the site.* ***Reason**: To ensure no impact on the River Itchen SAC due to contamination and changes in flow.* <u>Protection of the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA)</u> This site is within the buffer established to ensure no bird disturbance from visitors on the migratory birds within the Solent. In-combination impacts have been identified due to the quantity of new dwellings across a number of Local Authorities and the resulting visitor impact. To ensure no impact on the SPA the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy has been prepared to provide mitigation on site. To fund this mitigation all new houses within the 5.6km buffer, the area where most visitors emanate from a payment of £176 / dwelling should be levied.
Transportation & Engineering	<u>Holding objection</u> It is noted from a sign at the access to this section of Baltic Road, that the road is private. As such, what rights would future occupiers have to utilise the road accordingly. If they do not have a right to utilise the road, then the development needs to be designed with access via Hope Road, otherwise in a worst

REF. NO. O/16/77848

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	case scenario, there would be an eventual need for (i.e.) a pathway through the boundary of 45 Hope Road, with residents parking on-street. This would not be welcomed due to (a) loss of amenity for existing residents and (b) parking on the bend which could have safety implications. The development would need to be planned with an access from Hope Road, and parking for both dwellings (45 and new) clearly provided for on-site. If access rights to the development can however be demonstrated, then from a highway perspective there would be no objection. The site provides the required minimum of 2 parking spaces for the 2-bed development, and this is accessed from the driveway leading n to Baltic Road with an appropriate width to turn. It would however be preferable for there to be an on-site turning area afforded in order to access and egress the site in a forward gear. This would realistically be more for convenience however, given the low level of vehicle movements associated at the end of the road. In regard to transport developer contributions, though the development will not individually have a significant impact on the local highway network, accumulatively with other developments there will doubtless be a requirement for highway mitigation and improvement works. As such, it is requested that this application contributes to these works as they arise. In line with the reasonable and tested HCC Transport Contribution Policy criteria, for a development of a 2 bed dwelling equates to a request for £3,745 (+ indexation). Unfortunately, Eric is unavailable for comment at this time. However, it is noted from some consultee comments that there may be a public sewer running within the boundary of No 45. As such, information outlining the location of this would likely be required to demonstrate it will not be affected by the proposals.

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within HRA screening area Within Flood Zones 2 & 3 Within 8km of a Main River Buffer Within Special Protection Area-recreational disturbance zone

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) saved policies:
28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling), 34.ES (Energy and Climate Change), 43.ES (Flooding), 59.BE (Development Criteria), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T (Parking), 147.OS (Public Open Space), 190.IN (Community Infrastructure Provision) 191.IN (Social Infrastructure).

REF. NO. O/16/77848

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

The Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 :
DM1 (Design), DM2 (Environmentally Sustainable Development), DM23 (Transport contributions), DM24 (Parking Provision), DM25 (Residential Development in Urban Areas), DM29 (Internal Space Standards for residential development), DM32 (contributions open space) and DM37 (funding infrastructure).

Also of relevance is the guidance set out in the following Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) Quality Places 2011, Environmentally Sustainable Development 2009, Residential Parking Standards 2009, Biodiversity & and Planning Obligations 2008.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports and encourages sustainable development which is considered to have three roles, economic, social and environmental. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF states that "These roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions."

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out the "presumption in favour of sustainable development" in both plan-making and decision-taking.

Paragraph 17 sets out twelve core principles that underpin the planning system, one of which is that planning should "always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings".

Paragraph 49 states that, "Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites."

Paragraph 53 of the NPPF states that "Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area."

Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that "The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people."

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Comments are noted and will be discussed in the assessment section. A Habitat Regulations assessment has not been carried out as the proposal is recommend for refusal.

REF. NO. O/16/77848

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Comments are noted and will be considered within the assessment section.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of the following;

- National Planning Policy Guidance
- Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (SI 2010/948) as amended by the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011 (2011/987)
- Saved policies *101.T, 147.OS* and *191.IN* of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011
- Emerging policies *DM23, DM32, DM35* and *DM37* of the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2011-2029
- Supplementary Planning Document – Planning Obligations

Planning obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards *Community Infrastructure, Sustainable Transport, Public Open Space & Solent Mitigation & Disturbance Project*. While the applicant has agreed to secure the contributions through a Unilateral Undertaking, this has not been completed.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

> *"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."*

Principle

The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is considered to be acceptable, with any formal planning approval being based upon the exact nature, design and impact of that proposed being considered appropriate and in accordance with the relevant Local Plan policies and Supplementary Planning Documents.

The most relevant policy in this case is saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan which requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, to make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, loss of outlook, and noise and fumes. Also of relevance is Policy DM1 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029, July 2014, which essentially reiterates the above requirements.

Design, Street Scene & Area Character

The proposal is for outline planning permission for a two bed chalet bungalow with front and rear dormer windows. Although the dwelling is located in the rear garden of 45 Hope Road, it will face onto Baltic Road and will be read as part of that street scene within a negligible impact on the Hope Road street scene. While Baltic Road contains a collection of both two and single storey dwellings, the proposal will be sited directly next to Barton, which from the front appears as a small bungalow at the end of a row of mostly bungalows. No information has been provided as to the massing and appearance of the proposed chalet bungalow, which bulk has the potential to overshadow its immediate neighbour at Barton.

REF. NO. O/16/77848

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The proposed plot is an irregular shape with only a small section of its boundary directly adjoining Baltic Road. As a result the new dwelling has been angled and pushed back within the plot, so that it appears cramped with little visible space around the building to separate it from its neighbour at Barton. The orientation and position of the dwelling, which is significantly further back that the neighbouring building, would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development. Barton Road being characterised by properties fully visible and siting parallel to the road, siting along a straight building line that runs from north to south.

For these reasons the siting, massing and nature of the proposed dwelling would be incongruous to the established pattern of development along Baltic Road and will significantly harm its overall character. The application is therefore contrary to saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Local Plan and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD. These policies are also in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, which encourages Council's to refuse planning permission *"for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions" (paragraph 64)*.

Residential Amenity

The proposal is for a chalet bungalow with front and rear dormer windows sited in the bottom of the garden of 45 Hope Road. While some of the site boundaries are reasonably well screened by trees, others such as alongside no.47, have mid height fencing allowing views over the rear of the adjoining gardens. The proposal is for a sizable structure which will have a footprint of 80m2 and will take up most of the width of the plot and about a third of its depth. It is considered that the construction of a two storey structure of this scale within an area of open gardens will undoubtedly form a visually imposing built form, which will harm the outlook of the dwellings at 43, 45 & 47 Hope Road, particularly when viewed from their private rear gardens.

Furthermore, even with boundary fencing, the first floor rear dormer windows will look directly back up towards the existing bungalow & its garden and to some extent the gardens of no's 43 & 37. A dwelling in this position will make the existing properties feel overlooked and result in a perceived loss of privacy and so have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents.

The proposed dwelling will also have an impact on the property at Barton, which has a window in its side elevation only metres away from the building. The size of the window suggests that it might serve a upper floor bedroom or primary room, and as such the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook and daylight from this room to the detriment of the residents of this property.

Due to the loss of amenity from neighbouring dwellings the proposal would be contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Local Plan and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Access & Highway Safety

The council's residential parking standards require two on site parking spaces to be provided for a dwelling of this size. While the site plan shows two tandem spaces at the front of the dwelling, the

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

spaces themselves do not appear to directly connect to Baltic Road, which in any case is a private rather than a public road (as confirmed within the third party objection letters). No evidence has been provided that the occupiers of the proposed dwelling would have rights of access over Baltic Road and without which the proposal would fail to provide any useable car parking. This would lead to further pressure on street car parking within the locality, which would interrupt the free flow of traffic and cause a hazard to road users. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy 59.BE of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review [2001-2011], Policies DM1 and DM24 of the Submitted Local Plan and Residential Parking Standards SPD. A holding objection has been raised by the Council's Transportation Team.

Amount of Development

The proposed chalet bungalow will have an internal floor area of roughly 160m2, which exceeds the Council's minimum space standards of 77m2 for a two bed dwelling (as set out within Policy DM29). The rear garden of no.45 will be evenly split between both the existing and the proposed dwellings, each of the resulting gardens being roughly 122m2. The garden sizes meet the council's required standard of at least 60% of the floor space of their respective dwellings (as set out within Quality Places SPD). As such the proposed dwelling is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the plot.

Flooding & Nature Conservation

The site is within 5.5m of the Lower Itchen a significant tributary of the River Itchen and is located within flood zones 2 & 3. The site is part of the garden of 45 Hope Road, which is in a relatively low point compared to neighbouring land and is at time waterlogged. The proposal will replace part of the garden with a chalet bungalow and associated hard standing for two cars, which will have the effect of reducing the area of open ground available for water drainage. No flood risk assessment has been provided to show how the site will be defended from flooding or how the surface water will be deal with, which is already a problem within the site. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy 43.ES of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan [2001-2011], Policy DM6 of the Submitted Local Plan [2011-2029] and The National Planning Policy Framework.

The Itchen is designated along its length under the European Union Habitats Directive and as such the development should ensure no pollution enters into the stream and that water flows are maintained. The Ecology Officer has not raised an objection to the proposal, as the impact can be alleviated by providing further information regarding construction working practices at reserved matters stage. A habitat regulation assessment has not been undertaken as the proposal is recommend for refusal.

Trees

Although there are a number of trees along and around the site boundaries, only the mature trees positioned between Glenwood and 2 Old School Gardens are covered by Blanket Tree Preservation Order (Order 96). The TPO order is around 8m distance from the edge of the site and having spoken to the Tree Officer the proposal has the potential to cause damage to these mature trees, dependant on the tree size and exact position. No tree survey or arboricultural information has been provided as part of the submission. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policy 59.BE of the adopted Local Plan, Policy DM1 of the Submitted Local Plan and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

REF. NO. O/16/77848

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Public Sewer

It is understood that there is a public sewer running within the boundary of No 45, which depending on its position could be adversely impacted by the construction of the new dwelling. Although no information has been provided on the position of the sewer, it maybe possible to have the sewer divert with the consent of Southern Water. As such this issue is not considered to form a reason for refusal.

Developer contributions

Planning obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Community Infrastructure, Sustainable Transport & Public Open Space. The site also falls inside the 5.6km buffer zone for the Solent Special Policy Area and a contribution of £172 per dwelling is not required to mitigate the increased recreational pressure on the Solent nature area resulting from the development.
While the applicant has agreed to secure the contributions through a Unilateral Undertaking, this has not been completed. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 Policies DM23, DM32, DM35 and DM37 of the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2011-2029 & Planning Obligations (Supplementary Planning Document).

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

Recommend Refusal