MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/17/80188

DESCRIPTION	Erection of 9no. dwellings, 6no. three bed and 3no. four bed houses with vehicular access, parking, landscaping and refuse storage. (Amended Description).
ADDRESS	Land to the rear of 86 Edward Avenue, Bishopstoke, Eastleigh, SO50 6DY

SITE VISIT DATE	March 2017			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?		Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	Yes, furthermore a site notice was erected adjacent to the site advertising the application.			

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application has been revised during the course of the application. The number of proposed dwellings has been reduced from 10 to 9 dwellings. The building are of two storey with pitched roof forms. The mix is 6 dwellings providing 3 bedroom and the remaining 3 provide 4 bedrooms. The properties have facing brick elevations and tiled roofs. An access road runs along the southern boundary of the site. Bin storage and on-site parking are also provided.
SITE AREA	0.34 ha
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	26.4 dwellings per hectare
TOPOGRAPHY	Ground level fall across the site from south east to north west
TREES	The site contains trees offered protection via tree preservation order 635-E. The impact of the proposal on protected trees forms part of the consideration of the application
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Due to the size of the site the boundary treatments are a mix of trees, shrubs and timber fencing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The site is located on the north eastern edge of

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

	Bishopstoke, off Stoke Common Road. At present the site contains a detached bungalow and associated outbuildings. The generous rear garden of that bungalow forms the development plot. The southwest boundary of the site abuts residential properties that are predominately of a single storey 'bungalow' design. These properties are both detached and semi-detached.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	To the north south and west of the site are residential properties. The predominant built form is two storey semi-detached dwellings. That said the properties of Rogers Road are bungalows although this built form is not typical of the wider area. The woodland areas to the east are designated as Sites of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINCs). Bishopstoke Cemetary is located to the north east of the site. Further beyond the cemetary is the recent implementation of consents O/13/76660 and R/15/76716 that provides 60 dwellings, allotments and an extension to the existing cemetery.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/17537/000/00	Extension	Permit 1977

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
4 Drake Road 78 Edward Avenue 80 Edward Avenue 1 Rogers Road 3 Rogers Road 5 Rogers Road 20 Rogers Road 31 Rogers Road 33 Rogers Road 37 Rogers Road 43 Rogers Road 20 Spring Lane	Too many houses are proposed to be built The type of houses are not in relation to the surrounding buildings, for example, properties in the surrounding areas are bungalows these proposed properties are two story houses that will overlook neighbours private spaces. The suggestion to remove the trees g3 in property number 3, will again invade the privacy off at least five properties in rogers road, that being number 1 to 9. Proposed plots 9 and 10 too close to properties 5 and 7.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
7 Stoke Common Road 131 Stoke Common Road 62 Stoke Park Road	Proposed removal of sweet chestnut tree g5 will be detrimental to wildlife, that being residence of great spotted woodpeckers and bats. Because of the potential of another three cars per household on proposed development will increase traffic within the areas of Edward avenue, stoke park road and bishopstoke road. Access to proposed development is unsafe and may lead to potential road accidents. The proposal will result in additional traffic on an already busy corner junction with three exits onto Edward Avenue/Stoke Common Road Car parking area and landscaping too close to trees at the back of number 5 and 7 rogers road, making it impossible for me to trim back and maintain trees. More stress on overloaded local services such as Doctors, Schools. It is worth noting that this site has almost no local facilities and the only bus route has been cancelled. It will be to the detriment of our properties with large lorries driving along our boundaries and excavation of the soil whilst building work is in progress in an area already prone to subsidence. The proposal could have a detrimental impact on the new cemetery adjacent to the site, that should be a peaceful location. Asbestos has been burnt and buried upon the site. Risk of contamination. No flood risk document has been provided. Devaluation of the existing properties bordering this land. Approval of the application will continue the construction traffic that is soon to be brought to a close on the neighbouring site. Neighbouring sites have not conformed to their delivery terms The highway is damaged from the delivery vehicles Increased traffic at peak times Increased surface run off and flooding

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Bishopstoke Parish Council	The Committee agreed to object on the grounds of: overdevelopment; properties overlooking each other, and existing dwellings; the size and location of plot 5 not being suitable; damage to TPO trees; proximity to the Cemetery; the height of the proposed dwellings – it being felt that if any dwellings are to be built they should be in keeping with Rogers Road rather than Edwards Avenue; the access to Edward Avenue – the proposals would lead to three roads joining Edward Avenue on the same bend which poses a risk to safety; the likelihood of asbestos sheds having been buried in the ground some years ago 9 dwellings is too many to squeeze on a plot that size. The Committee also questioned whether the Borough Council currently has enough enforcement officers to ensure any work is done correctly. Concerns over the number of visitor parking spaces and the problems flagged by Southern Water regarding the SUDS. No work has been done regarding land contamination. The housing is neither what is needed by Bishopstoke as a whole, nor is it in keeping with the local area. There does not appear to be sufficient buffer between the development and the Cemetery Extension. Questions were also raised as to why the Forestry Commission had not been consulted. There has already been one near miss on the blind bend where it is proposed to add a third road entrance. Should the application be permitted, the Committee indicated

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	there would need to be a condition that work cease for a period before and after interments were taking place to allow those laying loved ones to rest to do so peacefully.
Hampshire County Highways	HCC raise **no objection** Whilst the quantum of development is relatively high for the use of a vehicle crossover, it is acceptable in this circumstance due to the level of visibility, and as it retains pedestrian priority which should be relatively high in this location. The application site has been designed sufficiently to allow for emergency and delivery vehicle access to be achievable, with adequate on-site turning turning areas enabling forward gear access and egress In accordance to the HCC Transport Contributions Policy, For the development quantum outlined, 3 x 4-bed at £5,457, plus 6 x 3-bed at £3,745, this would equate to. Additionally, due to the location of the access drive, an additional transport contribution of £6K is requested for the provision of Traffic Regulation Orders in the local vicinity.
Head of Environmental Health	Would seek conditions relating to: Contaminated land survey Hours of work No burning Construction Management Plan
Hampshire County Archaeologist	No archaeological issues.
Head of Housing Services	Unless the gross floorspace for this application is in excess of 1000sqm, there will not be an affordable housing requirement.
Head of Countryside and Trees	Following the amendments, raise no arboricultural objection to the proposed development, subject to conditions.
Airport Safeguarding	No Objection
Hampshire Garden Trust	No Comments Received
Southern Water Services	No objection made. Informatives are provided relating to Sustainable Urban Drainage systems and connection to existing services.
Head of Planning Policy	No Comments Received
Biodiversity Officer	Recommend a condition for a Construction Environment Management Plan

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	Notes that tree loss has been limited within the site but still recommend a condition that secures a safe methodology for dormice. Although native mix of planting is included within the landscaping scheme this is not entirely indigenous containing a number of cultivars. A condition can be imposed requiring a planting plan is attached to any permission granted

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Adjacent Site of Nature Conservation Interest

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

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011)

23.NC – Protection of SINCs,
25.NC – Promotion of biodiversity,
28.ES – Waste collection and storage,
34.ES – Reduction of greenhouse gases,
35.ES –Contaminated land
36.ES – Lighting,
37.ES – Renewable energy and efficient use of resources,
45.ES – Sustainable Drainage requirements,
59.BE (Promoting good design),
100.T (Minimise Travelling)
104.T (Parking)
16.8.LB Archaeological evaluation
191.IN (Social Infrastructure)

Submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, July 2014, (the Submitted Local Plan) comprising:

- Revised Pre-submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011 - 2029, published February 2014; and
- Schedule of Proposed Minor Changes, submitted to the Secretary of State in July 2014'

(Development Criteria), 72.H (Density), 75.H (Density), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T. (Parking), 147.OS (Public Open Space), 191.IN (Social Infrastructure).

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Biodiversity

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

Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Bishopstoke Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area 3

Guidance:
• Maintain the formal building compositions around route intersections and cul-de-sacs.
• Maintain the predominant shallow building setbacks in order to retain the sense of enclosure provided by existing development.
• Maintain a uniformity in building heights within each street.
• Ensure that the form of new development relates effectively with the hipped roofs and gabled bay windows prominent in existing development.

Other Features: 1970s to present day detached bungalows with deeper set backs at western end of Edward Avenue.

Strength of Character: moderate.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The site is not located within a special policy area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

In respect of this application, the following sections or paragraphs of the NPPF are considered to be of particular relevance:

- Para. 6 – purpose of planning system is to deliver sustainable development
- Para. 7 – three dimensions of sustainability to be sought jointly – economic (supporting economy and ensuring land availability), social (providing housing, creating high quality environment with accessible local services); environmental (contributing to, protecting and enhancing natural, built and historic environment).
- Para. 10 – plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.
- Para. 14 – presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- Para. 17 – sets out 12 core planning principles, including principle that planning should be plan-led and not just about scrutiny but a creative exercise to improve and enhance places in which people live, to proactively drive sustainable economic development, to seek high quality design, support low carbon technologies, promote mixed use, manage patterns of growth and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities.
- Para. 30 – encouragement should be given to solutions which support

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion.

- Para. 47 – local plans to boost supply of housing to meet needs of market and affordable housing; to identify key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy, identify and update specific deliverable sites to provide five years supply of housing.
- Para. 49 – housing applications to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the LPA cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- Para. 56 – requirement for good design.
- Para. 58 – policies and decisions should aim to ensure developments establish a strong sense of place; optimise the potential of the site; respond to local character and history; create safe and accessible environments; are visually attractive as result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.
- Para. 60 – policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes. It is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
- Para. 103 – ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
- Para. 109 – seeks to minimise impacts on biodiversity and protect unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution and remediating contaminated land where appropriate.
- Para. 118 - decisions should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity. If significant harm cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. If development is likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI, an exception should only be made where the benefits clearly outweigh the impacts. Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around development should be encouraged. Permission should be refused for proposals resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland unless the need for and benefits of development clearly outweigh the loss.
- Para. 120 – Decisions should ensure that sites are suitable for its new use taking into account ground conditions, any pollution from former activities and any pollution to general amenity.
- Para. 121 – ensure site is suitable for its new use in terms of ground conditions, land stability etc.
- Para. 123 – avoid, mitigate and reduce noise which gives rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life.
- Para. 124 – planning policies should sustain compliance with and contribute towards EU limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking into account AQMAs and the cumulative impacts on air quality from individual sites in local areas. Planning decisions should ensure that any new development in AQMAs is consistent with the local air quality action plan.
- Para. 128 – where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment, and where necessary a field evaluation.
- Para. 192 – The right information is crucial to good decision-taking, particularly where formal assessments are required (such as EIA/HRA/FRA).

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

- Para 203 - LPAs should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations.
- Para 204 – obligations should only be sought where they are necessary, directly related, related fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the development.
- Para 216 - decision-takers can give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency to the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF.

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, trees, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

X	See below		Other……

The parish council has raised an objection to the proposal. The matters relating to the character of the area, trees, the amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring properties, the maintenance of those properties, highway safety, the cemetery, land contamination and flood risk form the material considerations of the application below.

No other objections have been raised and the suggested conditions and informatives are considered to be appropriate.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

X	See below		Other……

The matters relating to the character of the area, trees, the amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring properties, the maintenance of those properties, highway safety, the cemetary, land contanmination and flood risk form the material considerations of the application below.

The loss of house values is outside the remit of the appeal, as is the loss of private views.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Saved Policies 147.OS and 191.IN respectively state that where development involves a net increase in residential units, the Council will seek agreements for a contribution towards open space provision in the locality as well as for the provision of infrastructure, services, facilities and amenities directly made necessary by the development.

An Air Quality Management Area a tariff of £100 per residential unit has been requested by Environmental Health.

Hampshire county Council has requested a contribution of £38,841in line with the tarrifs outlined within the HCC Transport Contributions Policy

Following the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which gave legal effect to the policy as set out in the Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014, and the subsequent changes to the National Planning Practice Guidance, the threshold for which affordable housing and tariff based contributions can be sought has been increased. This means that developments of 10 units or less (and which have a maximum combined floor space of no more than 1000sqm) will be exempt from the need to provide tariff based planning obligations or affordable housing.

However, £6,000 has been requested by Hampshire County Council for a Traffic Regulation Order for works that directly mitigate the proposal. These monies have been secured and paid up front during the application

The site falls outside the 5.6kn buffer zone for the Solent SPA. A contribution is not required to mitigate the increased recreational pressure resulting from the development.

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

To the extent that the site falls within the existing urban area, further residential development is not contrary to national or local policy. Since the publication of the NPPF in 2012 however private residential gardens in urban areas are explicitly not part of the definition of ‘previously developed’ or brownfield land and thus development here would not, by definition, be contributing to the NPPF sustainable development objective of encouraging the re-use of such land.

It might also be noted that the Council published its latest ‘5 Year Housing Land Supply’ in September 2017 which estimated that Eastleigh had 5.26 years supply for the five year period from 1/7/17. Thus the Council’s ‘policies for the supply of housing’ are not rendered out of date by the absence of a five year supply as set out in the NPPF. A recent Supreme Court decision has narrowed what might be considered as such policies to exclude those

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

that are not directly related to housing supply.

Design and Impact on the Character of the Area:

Saved Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan 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.

The site lies adjacent to an area of established housing and would therefore not be isolated or away from all other development. When approaching the site form the north along Stoke Common Road screening of the development will be provided by the located to the north of the existing bungalow and the bungalow itself.

The entrance to the site will not afford significant views into the site. Views of the upper floors and roof forms of the proposed dwellings will be available when the site is viewed over the bungalows of Rogers Road however the designs of the property are considered to be in keeping with the residential character of the area.

Layout

The proposed layout shows the residential development located at the north and eastern end of the site, accessed via the existing route off Stoke Common Road. A main access road runs along the southern boundary and dwelling are arranged in an L-shape around this road. The dwellings face onto a road or private drive and the majority of plots have on-plot parking in the form of drives and garages. For those that don't have a drive or garage parking is provided within a parking court and parking standards have been met.

Scale

As stated above the proposed dwellings are 2 storey in height, both detached and semi-detached. In addition The existing bungalow at the entrance to the site is to be retained. The scale of all buildings is considered to be acceptable given the established character of the area.

Materials

A schedule of materials has been provided by the applicant. The schedule is generic it its description the materials. I order to ensure that materials of an appropriate texture, clout and style are used on the properties a condition requiring the submission of samples can be imposed.

Affordable Housing

The application seeks to provide 9 dwellings. This is under the Governments threshold for the provision of affordable housing.

Residential Amenity:

Saved Policy 59.BE (vii.) requires that development avoids unduly impacting upon the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, in particular by way of overbearing

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

impact, loss of light or outlook, and overlooking.

To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places has been produced which gives guidance on overlooking, loss of light, amenity space for new dwellings and refuse storage.

The proposed dwellings will be located to the north of the neighbouring properties of Rogers Road as such the proposals are not considered to result in a material harm to the levels of light currently enjoyed by the occupiers of those neighbouring properties.

With regard to privacy the provision of accommodation in the roofspace of a number of the bungalows to the south has already resulted into some overlooking into the rear amenity areas of some of the bungalows. In particular the dormer windows of 80 Edward Avenue, 1 and 11 Rogers Road.

Concern has been raised that the proposal will overlook the properties of Rogers Road. The properties within the development will be separated from the properties of Rogers Road by the access Road that runs through the site. This differs it at the eastern end of the site where the side elevation of Plot 9 will be located in closer proximity to the boundary. This elevation does contain an upper floor window. The window serves a stairwell and it cane therefore be considered reasonable for it to be obscure glazed and fixed such. Such a restriction can be secured by condition. Whilst plot 9 is located within close proximity to the sites southern boundary, the bungalows in this section of Roger Road have lengthier rear gardens mitigation and potential overbearing impact.

Significant screening will be provided by the Cyprus trees along the southern boundary. Further landscape planting within the application site includes a Prunius Hillieri Spire (Flowering Cherry) and a Corylus colurna (Turkish hazel) The cherry can be expected to reach a heigh of 8-12 metres and a spread of 4-8 metres, the hazel 12 metres in height with a spread of 8 metres. Both are proposed to be planted as mature samples.

It is accepted that the proposed dwellings will be visible from the neighbouring bungalows, however views are not protected through the planning system and the proposed dwelling are not considered to result in any material harm to the outlook from those properties.

It is considered that the level of separation and screening will ensure that the proposed development does not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of existing residents in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing impact. In addition new boundary planting is proposed where existing boundary planting is limited.

Clearly there will be disruption when the appeal site turns into a building site for a period of time. However, a detailed condition making provision for a Construction Method Statement has been suggested by the Council which places strict controls on aspects such as ways of working and hours of operation. The Council as development management authority has powers which can be exercised through this condition, to effectively address unreasonable behavior during the construction period.

Furthermore the Head of Environmental Health has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions that impose restricted working hours and no burning on the site.

Impact on Cemetery

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

It is noted that concerns have been raised about the impact on the tranquillity of the cemetery. However the proposal has a greater level of separation from the cemetery that the previously approved scheme of 60 dwellings to the north.

A condition has been requested that prevents works being undertaken on site whilst internments area taking place on the neighbouring cemetary. It is understandable why a reduced noise activity and noise level would be expected at such times. However imposing such a condition would not satisfy the test of conditions as outlined in the NPPF.

Highway Matters:

Saved Policy 104.T requires that adequate off-highway parking is provided to serve new development. Saved Policy 59.BE (v.) requires that development provides a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles which includes an appropriate level of parking provision in accordance with the Council's adopted Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Concerns have been expressed that Stoke Common Road could not take any more development, in relation to highway safety and increased traffic. Some residents objected to the alignment of the proposed vehicular access and alleged that the proposed development would be to the detriment of highweay safety. As a result during the course of the application revisions to the access have been made.

Hampshire County Council Highways Engineers have raised no objection in relation to any highway element of the scheme in terms of parking, highway access or internal layout.

With regard to the disruption created by delivery vehicles to the highway network it is proposed to impose a condition that requires the submission of a Construction Management Plan to be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Trees and Landscaping:

Saved Policy 59.BE (i) of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2001-2011 requires that development takes full and proper account of the context of the site including natural features and trees worthy of retention.

The site contains trees offered protection via tree preservation order 635-E. During the course of the application the scheme has been revised to reduce the number of proposed dwellings on the site from 10 to 9.

This measure has allowed a more spacious plot and reduce the conflict between the proposed dwellings and protected trees. Some trees on the site will be removed from the site as a result of implementing the scheme. Whilst regrettable the Head of Countryside and Trees has raised no objection to the loss of these trees subject to conditions that protect the trees retained on site.

A further condition can be imposed removing permitted development rights that could result in future development in close proximity to the protected trees.

Drainage and Flood Risk

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Although concerns were raised over flood risk, Southern Water has indicated that it has no objection in principle to the proposed development, subject to an appropriate condition to address sustainable drainage aspects.

Land Contamination

Previous use of the land that forms that application site does give rise to the risk of land contamination. Limited sources of contamination were identified through the desk study carried out for the planning application. However, there is still concern that the site does have the potential for land contamination as such conditions securing further investigatory works can be applied should the application receive consent.

On this basis it is considered that the scheme accords with NPPF paragraphs 120 and 121, policy 35.ES of the adopted Local Plan.

Biodiversity

In line with policies 25.NC and 26.NC of the adopted Local Plan, ecological assessments have been carried out to assess the impact of the proposals upon biodiversity interests. The site is in close proximity to three Sites for Interest for Nature Conservation (SINCs) designated for their special types of woodland including ancient woodland. The River Itchen SAC/SSSI lies to the north west of the site.

The site has been surveyed for protected species. The Biodiversity officer has raised no objection to the proposal. Further detail is required regarding site drainage and mitigation for bats and dormice. This information can be secured be agreed prior to commencement.

A Habitats Regulations Assessment has also been carried out to assess any significant likely impacts upon protected habitats. This has concluded that no likely significant effects upon the River Itchen SAC.

Flood Risk

The site is located within flood zone 1, meaning there is a very low risk of flooding.

In relation to foul water drainage, Southern Water has indicated there is currently inadequate capacity within the local network to provide foul sewage disposal to service the proposed development and that additional off-site sewers or improvements to existing sewers will be required to service the development. The applicant understands this would be a necessary element of the development and Southern Water has recommended a condition to ensure that such details are approved before development commences.

Archaeology

The County Archaeologist has confirmed no objection to the proposals. In light of these comments, the proposals are therefore considered to be in accordance with the guidance contained in the NPPF, Saved Policies 167.LB and 168.LB of the adopted Local Plan and Policy.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Reference needs to be made to the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local plan 2011-2029 July 2014. However, very little weight can be given to these policies as, although the Submission Local Plan has not been formally withdrawn, the Council has confirmed that it has decided to prepare a new local plan which will cover the period up to 2036. With regard to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to permit