

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT:

Application Ref: F/22/93160

Site Address: Land adjoining 4 Brookfield, Providence Hill, Bursledon, Southampton, SO31 8AU

Case Officer: Clare Martin

Description: Mixed use development comprising veterinary surgery and 16no. dwellings with vehicular access off Providence Hill and associated car parking, cycle storage, sustainable drainage system, sub station, hard and soft landscaping, acoustic fencing and pedestrian/ cycle links to Providence Hill.

Site Description:

The proposal is on a triangular shaped site of approximately 1.08 hectares on the northern side of Providence Hill (A27) located towards the outer edge of the Bursledon settlement boundary. The existing site has two distinct characters, the western side is neglected and overgrown, whereas the eastern side has been maintained as grass with a handful of small structures (sheds, greenhouses, polytunnels etc).

There are important mature trees along the site boundaries, and those along the northern and eastern boundaries are protected by tree preservation orders. The site levels slope steeply downwards from Providence Hill to a stream running along the northern site boundary, which flows into Windmill Woods Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

While the area is predominantly residential area, the site adjoins Bursledon Windmill and Conservation Area to the north and provides some limited visibility from Providence Hill through to the Grade II* listed Windmill. There is a footpath around the outside of the north-western tip of the site, which connects the housing area to the north (Goslings) to Providence Hill.

Proposal:

The planning application is for a veterinary practice building with a 19-space car park located on the western side of the site. On the eastern side is the residential part of the development comprising 14no. dwellings (comprising a mixture of two and three storey houses and maisonettes). The residential development includes private amenity spaces; a mixture of on plot and street car parking, a sustainable drainage system with attenuation pond, a pedestrian/ cycle link connecting the development to Providence Hill and landscaping. Both the vets practice and residential development are served from a new single point off Providence Hill.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
<u>Application Site</u> • Within Urban Edge • Within Allocated Housing Site • TPO trees along northern and eastern boundaries. • Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Site • Within Solent Mitigation and Disturbance Zone • Within New Forest Mitigation and Disturbance Zone <u>Adjacent Land</u> • Bursledon Windmill Conservation Area to the north of the site. • Site of Nature Conservation to north east of site.		

- Air Quality Management Area along Providence Hill

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• O/17/80899 - Outline: Erection of up to 20no. dwellings with associated parking, creation of new access from Providence Hill substation and attenuation pond (landscaping reserved) – Withdrawn (7th October 2020).		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☒
Representations: (summary)	The application received 23 letters of objection raising the following points: <u>Principle and Amount of Development</u> • Loss of green space • Overdevelopment of houses in the locality, including unsold properties in new building next to this site. • No need for vets as Adelaide vets is 0.4miles away, instead the space should be used for an additional doctors or dentists. • Proposed vets would not pass the sequential test <u>Highways and Infrastructure</u> • Detrimental impact on the local highways as this will increase traffic and vehicular movements onto an already congested network. • Traffic will have difficulties existing the site onto the A27. • Lack of public transport • Existing facilities already overstretched including lack of doctors & school places. • Proposal will lead to Increase flooding and overwhelming the drainage system. Edge of the field is waterlogged • Additional impact on the existing sewage system. <u>Visual Amenity</u> • Prominent and urbanising development • Impacts on the setting of Bursledon Windmill, which has already been compromised by the Goslings housing development. • 2.5m high acoustic fence will block view of the windmill from Providence Hill. • Plots 1 & 2 should be removed and make way for more landscaping. • Vital that the boundary trees and undergrowth are retained. However, the proposed landscaping will not be looked after. <u>Ecology and Trees</u> • Current field acts as wildlife corridor. Proposal will facilitate the decline in wildlife, as natural habitats of rare and protected species are being disturbed or destroyed. • Proposal doesn't achieve biodiversity net gain. • Development fails to strengthen and enhance SINC buffers (windmill field woods). Development would encourage the recreational use of the SINC. • Drainage pond is very deep and close to the tree roots (T17) • Arboricultural report says no tree losses, but large Oak Tree (T5) absent from proposed site plan. Concern raised about proximity of house (at Plot 14) to Oak Tree canopy.		

	• Trees on the eastern boundary belongs to neighbour (at the Merellos). • Ecological assessment shows old version of scheme in proposals plan (figure 1). <u>Impact on neighbouring residents</u> • Additional air quality and noise pollution • Overlooking of existing dwellings at Brookfield • Additional anti-social behaviour and litter • Request chain link fence to preserve residential amenity of immediate neighbours to east. <u>Other</u> • Additional housing will exacerbate urban heat island affect • Insufficient information provided within planning submission.
Eastleigh Borough Council Consultees: <i>(summarised)</i>	
Landscape Officer:	<u>Response to Amended Plans (Jan 2023)</u> Overall, it is considered that the changes made to the proposals do not adequately address the design issues. <u>SuDS</u> The attenuation pond does not integrate or contribute to the site. It still looks like an engineer led 'hole in the ground'. The design should seek to integrated SuDS in a way that maximises the four pillars outlined in the CIRIA manual. <u>Levels</u> The design relies on many retaining walls which introduce issues for safety and a heavily engineered aesthetic to the whole development. <u>Green Infrastructure</u> Some welcome changes have been made to improve the landscape treatments of the site. However, their effect is ultimately limited, due to the layout, retaining structures and SuDS. <u>Previous Response on Original Plans</u> <u>Levels</u> The site slopes steeply down from Providence Hill. Cross sections and levels details are required so the extent of the proposed cut and fill can be determined. However, I am extremely concerned with the extent of retaining structures currently shown. The majority of these structures are over 0.6m high, which will mean guardrails will be required adding to visual intrusion/clutter. Indeed stretches of the retaining wall next to the northern boundary may well be up to 3m high and so have an impact on the landscape character of this area and the adjacent stream. Furthermore, such extensive retaining structures will adversely impact retained trees, especially those needed for the vets building. <u>Sustainable Drainage System</u> The shape of the proposed attenuation pond is unimaginative, and this should be re-designed to have a more natural profile. This should be designed to be more than just a sterile 'hole in the ground'. Cross-

	sections are needed to prove this pond can be accommodated in this location, on such a sloping site, without adverse impact on the retained trees. <u>Green Infrastructure</u> The green infrastructure on the current layout is inadequate and not deliverable. Any provision of street trees is sporadic, and the extent of new tree planting is limited. Generally, areas of parking have not been provided with adequate tree planting and the Vet Surgery parking area is particularly stark. <u>Views of Bursledon Windmill</u> Although the vista towards the Windmill is indicated on the layout, it is relatively narrow and will be much changed from the present view across a field. The proposed view will have a 'hard' fore drop of drives and parking. It is regrettable that the positioning of Plots 3-5 prevents any tree planting that would have helped frame this view. Can space be created here for additional tree planting? Ideally, this vista should be tree lined on both sides of the view. <u>Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal</u> This should be re-visited with site photographs taken in winter months when it is likely the screening effect of existing vegetation will be much reduced. At present the views only illustrate maximum screening when vegetation is on leaf. <u>General Landscape Comments</u> • The positioning of the vets building results in 'pinch points' that will prevent robust boundary screen planting. • Tree and hedgerow screen planting should be introduced along the northern boundary to filter views of the new building. No planting is shown here at the moment, and this is not acceptable. • The vets parking area must be provided with tree planting to provide shade and filter internal views. Some of the parking bays could be reinforced gravel for a softer effect. • The proposed sub stn. adjacent Plots 1 & 2 is poorly sited and will be highly intrusive in views from Providence Hill (which will be opened up with the forming of the new site entrance). The sub-stn. should re-sited and/or screened with planting. The proposed barrier to the car park area should also be relocated to be less immediately apparent in views from the main road. • The location of Plots 1 & 2 and associated parking is awkward. The new houses and rear gardens reduce the width of the boundary buffer strip and necessitates excessive retaining walls and ramps. Ideally, these units should be dropped to maintain the width of the landscape buffer. • We would resist the inclusion of an acoustic barrier due to practical installation issues (impact on retained trees) plus added visual impact.
Urban Design Officer:	<u>Response to Amended Plans (Jan 2023)</u> The revised scheme does not appear to go far enough in terms of integrating the buildings successfully into the wider setting. <u>Levels</u> There are significant level changes across the site. On several occasions, it is noted that a substantial amount of retaining walls have been proposed to overcome them. More clarification is required to

understand the amount of engineering works and retaining structures that will need to be undertaken to deliver this scheme. It is a shame when the landform needs to be significantly modified to accommodate development.

Due to the complex topography of the site, the majority of the landscape area proposed is not considered to be usable space, therefore there is lack of public space provided to serve future residents. The overall aim is to create a residential area where buildings and spaces form an attractive and high-quality public realm

Veterinary Surgery

Although some attempt to improve its appearance has been made, I remain unconvinced that the external appearance of the Veterinary's building is in keeping with the character of the locality.

The design review panel's comments (dated 02/08/2022) remain valid as "the result is an awkward juxtaposition of materials and forms placed onto the 'front' of an otherwise dull flat roof boxy form." Whilst this may work in a much more urban context where there is a clear front and rear, that is not the case in this instance. Here, the building will be visible from all sides, each of a differing character, meaning that it must try to address each one in a manner that is appropriate to its setting and to the wider context, particularly given the close proximity of the Grade II* listed windmill.

In regards to the additional glazing to the elevation facing Goslings Turning, the awkward proportions of this opening exacerbates the fact that this would look alien when seen as a whole elevation.

Entrance Public Realm

Although improvements were made to the site entrance views, such as the removal of Plot 1&2, the introduction of an extensive area of native trees as well as some additional landscape on the Vet's car park, it is felt that the revised scheme does not appear to go far enough in terms of creating a welcoming experience and quality sense of arrival. As it stands, the residential scheme backing onto the internal access and the Vet's building pushed further back, it is considered that both uses have a poor contribution to create the most attractive of settings or approach into the development. Therefore, there is a missed opportunity to improve considerably the scheme.

Landscaping and Hard Surfacing

The hard paving strategy is unclear and large expanses of hard landscaped areas detract from the appearance of the scheme and dominate views into and through the development. Also, the parking design should be landscape-led, responding to the character of the place; it should be well integrated, with tree planting and avoid a public realm dominated by cars and hard standing.

Substation

The relocation of the substation and other minor amendments around the entrance area have a positive contribution to improve the experience and sense of arrival to the site.

Previous Comments on Original Plans

Overall Opinion:

	Whilst the proposal is for 16 dwellings and therefore less than the 19 cited in Policy BU1, the land-take of the veterinary surgery means that the dwellings are confined to the eastern part of the site in a cramped formation. Whilst the street layout broadly follows that of the approved scheme, the dispersal of dwellings on the site is completely different and as a result, while fewer dwellings are proposed than the emerging Policy permits, the cramped nature of the housing development suggests a congested form of development. <u>Summary:</u> • Existing views of landmarks must be preserved and enhanced • Site access dominated and constrained by overly-engineered highways and parking layouts based on outdated design guidance that prioritise vehicles over pedestrians, contrary to current urban design approaches • More thoughtful consideration needs to be given to the site entrance (in terms of quality of the public realm). • Plots 1 & 2 appear dislocated from the remainder of the residential development • The topography of the site in particular is complex, a series of sectional drawings through the site would allow the relationship between the development and levels to be better understood • Large expanses of hard landscaped areas detract from the appearance of the scheme and dominate views into and through the development • Layout will fail to encourage street play and general sociability due to vehicular priority throughout.
Design Review Panel: (Comments on original plans)	<u>Principle</u> No concerns were raised regarding the proposed mixed use of the site, particularly given the two uses – veterinary practice and residential housing – were physically separated. However, there still needs to be a relationship between the two halves of the site, particularly around the site entrance where the quality of the public realm will need thoughtful consideration. <u>Levels</u> The topography of the site in particular is complex, and it was not entirely clear how various elements of the development would relate to the existing and proposed final levels. A 3D model or series of sectional drawings are required. The success of the scheme will depend on how level changes are addressed. This bottom end of the site appears to have a relatively soft and natural feel, which could easily be lost by resorting to harsh engineered solutions to deal with levels and drainage. <u>Plots 1&2</u> These plots appear somewhat dislocated from the remainder of the residential development and could appear rather awkward when viewed from the site access. <u>Views</u> While the scheme considers views from Providence Hill across the site to the Windmill, views created through the existing treeline for the vehicular access also need to be considered. Presently you would be greeted by the roof of Plots 1&2 and a quite extensive gated area of car parking for the vets, which would not create the most attractive of settings or approach into the development.

	<u>Vets Building</u> The appearance of the veterinary building, however, did raise concern. Whilst it was accepted that it is a functional building with a relatively inflexible internal layout, this does not mean that equal thought to the exterior of the building should not be given. For instance, windows on the ground and first floor do not align, and the flat roof boxy form is not in keeping with the character of the locality. Although some attempt to improve its appearance has been made, the result is an awkward juxtaposition of materials and forms placed onto the 'front' of an otherwise dull brick box. <u>Vets Car Park</u> The veterinary practice car park dominates the space between the main site entrance and the building itself and will require extensive engineered retaining structures to level off the steeply sloping site for both the car park and building. Not only is the site steeply sloping in this location, it is also visible from all sides, and squeezed between two fairly dense treelines. Consideration should be given to re-siting the car park. <u>Residential Development</u> Architecturally the residential element of the scheme appears to be of a relatively standard design, much like recently constructed neighbouring schemes. Whilst using a 'traditional' design was not considered to be an issue, care still needs to be taken to ensure proportions, detailing and materials are of a good quality and that basic urban design rules, such as ensuring elevations address the street in an appropriate manner, are followed.
Built Heritage Consultant: (Comments on original plans)	<u>Holding Objection</u> <u>Summary</u> This is the last piece of green lung left on Providence Hill that gave some credence to the rural setting of the Grade II* listed Bursledon Windmill. The new housing has some reference to the local vernacular to materials, particularly the black weatherboarding, bricks and plain tiles. There is variety in the building forms and material use. Furthermore, the change from housing to veterinary practice on the western portion of the site allows a significant portion of the site to be building-free retaining a far more rural feel as one drives up the road and so much more appropriate for the setting of the Bursledon Windmill <u>Encroachment</u> The western boundary of the 'agreed easement view to Bursledon Windmill' appears to have been moved by easing the western boundary to the east when one compares the current plan with the pre-app one, meaning units 1 & 2 and 3 to 5 encroach into the wedge, added to which a row of half a dozen parked cars appears across the space diminishing the remaining rural quality of the view of the setting of the windmill which is of national importance. The parking for the new housing within the space close to the Providence Hill boundary in the dip, is less obvious. <u>Plots 1 & 2</u> These units need to be moved west a bit and units 3 – 5 rotated west a little on the south-east corner in order to follow the wedge boundary and not form a parallel 'tunnel' with those on the other side of the road. The car parking for the vets practice would benefit from some

	landscaping to break up the apparent extent of it. <u>Vets Building</u> The siting of the vets practice building allows its bulk to be dissipated by the rising ground and is further ameliorated by stone areas and 'a front end' of contrasting materials. Brick and timber are of course the local indigenous materials and the contrasting stone and curtain walling of the vertical movement element emphasize the public face together with the glazed frontage of the reception area wrapped around the other corner, allowing the animal clients to look out and not seem to be in such an intimidating environment as it would be with normal cill height windows. <u>Plant</u> The eastern end is the best place to site the plant that will hum, therefore, not disturbing residents and it would be best if any a/c units were out of sight.
Ecology Officer: (Comments on original plans)	<u>Ecological Measures:</u> The recommendations in the Ecological Impact Assessment by ACD (rev A, September 2022) are sound and can be conditioned in a management plan, including a construction environmental management plan or landscape environmental/ biodiversity enhancement management plan. Details and measures include an updated badger survey; invasive plant removal; soft-felling for the horse chestnut tree with low bat roost suitability; a wildlife-sensitive lighting scheme; a landscape management and monitoring plan; mitigation/ habitat for nesting birds; timings for vegetation clearance; householder packs to contain information on cat predation of wildlife & inclusion of reptile receptor areas. <u>Landscaping</u> Landscaping scheme needs to be amended to remove cherry laurel, which is an invasive plant. Any pruning of native shrubs and hedges must be done on a three year rotation to maintain a year round supply of flowers, fruit and seeds available to wildlife. <u>Sustainable Drainage System</u> The proposed levels of the SuDS feature would make this a very steep drop with very steeply sloping sides, which would be dangerous. This is not acceptable for a housing development. What is the planting plan for the attenuation basin? How is the two part swale proposed to work, as it looks like the water flow would split and either go one way or the other, then come back together. This would then be one treatment method, not two, as stated in the Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy document.
Tree Officer:	<u>Objection</u> I am not convinced that the proposal can be implemented with the level of claimed impact. There are some significant issues to resolve including, but not limited to: • <u>Levels</u> – the site has a pronounced slope and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this has been considered arboriculturally. Indeed, the impact assessment states that information on levels "remain to be finalised".

	• <u>Attenuation Pond</u> – the attenuation pond label states that it is indicative and that it will be “marked out on site to avoid the RPAs...”. This really isn’t appropriate at full planning and we will require more firm plans. • <u>Access</u> – the access is a significant issue: it is within the RPAs of two category A trees. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that it is achievable to bridge over the RPAs to create an access, whilst marrying the levels. The only argument made by the arboriculturists is that the access point was previously approved. However, this is false as no extant permission exists and, regardless, it irrelevant for this application before us. • <u>Services</u> – the tree line constrains the site regarding services in and out. Whilst this is often not considered at this stage, the tree line is pretty rare in that it is largely unbroken, save for the far southeast. Obviously, boring is a theoretical option, but details will need to be considered. • <u>Detail within AMS and AIA</u> – the AMS is generic and does not give site-specific details; the AIA only deals with the obvious impacts (e.g. tree removals, 2-demnsional application of hardstanding, etc); and we are not convinced of the workability of the position of the tree protection fencing (e.g. to the south of the proposed vet surgery). Further, the fencing sometimes misses the RPAs – for example, T57. • <u>Insufficient Information</u> – A 15 x RPA has apparently been provided for T23, which is a veteran. However, the RPA measure around 14-15 metres in diameter (it is not possible to tell accurately because the plan does not contain a scale bar). No tree survey has been provided, which means it is impossible to know what the measurement should be. However, a previous application stated that the stem diameter was 1400 mm, which would result in a 21 metre RPA. This will need addressing and would result in development (plots 1 and 2) being either very close or in the RPA.
Environmental Health Officer (contamination):	Detailed comments provided on the environmental report and desk top study. <u>No objection</u>, subject to conditions requiring additional site investigation and risk assessment is carried out and report of its findings submitted to the local planning authority for approval Following that a site-specific remedial scheme, for the ground gas protection of buildings, and soil remediation must be submitted prior to the commencement of the construction of the buildings.
Environmental Health Officer (amenity):	The noise and air quality assessments are logical and well explained. In summary, noise impact to dwellings can be reduced by fenestration insulation and alternative means of ventilation and levels of nitrogen dioxide are high, close to the absolute limit of the Air Quality Objectives. We must also be appraised of levels of particulate matter. <u>Further Information Required</u> • The development needs to include an assessment with computer aided calculation models using road traffic engineering (or traffic count data). • Please confirm how advice on design or layout of the site has been considered from a noise and amenity perspective (what is possible and what is not). • Is there a possible solution negotiable with the local authority / highways to allow a noise barrier installation within their boundary

	Please explore the feasibility of such an accommodation by the local authority. If feasible, this would be a better environmental outcome for the development application. We would also like to know about noise from substation and electromagnetic radiation from this and cables.
Housing Enabling Officer: (Comments on original plans)	Development is required to provide 35% affordable housing, which equates to 6 dwellings. The overall affordable is proposed is 2No 2bed 4-person maisonettes, 2No 2 bed 4-person houses, 1No 3 bed 5 person house & 1No 3 bed 6 person house. The provision of rented and shared ownership homes is acceptable, however, these need to be by way of 4No homes for rent and 2No homes for shared ownership. The submitted information advises that the proposal is for 2No rented homes and 4No for shared ownership which does not reflect our policy position as detailed above. Our suggested mix for rent was 2No maisonettes and 2No 3 bed houses.
Direct Services (Street Scene):	No objection
Direct Services (Refuse):	No response
Hampshire County Council Consultees: (summarised)	
Highways Officer: (Comments on original plans)	<u>Overall Comments</u> Whilst there would be no objection in principle to the application, it would be requested that the additional vehicle tracking drawings are supplied, and that the Case officer considers other comments such as the additional footway and refuse collection points prior to a positive decision being issued. Recommend conditioning approval of a construction method statement and installation/ retention of parking. <u>Site Access</u> The site will be accessed via a simple priority junction onto Providence Hill, which is a replication of that proposed under the withdrawn application. Whilst adequate visibility splays are achievable, and an independent Road Safety Audit raised no issue in this regard, it is noted that no two-way vehicle tracking has been provided to show how two-way movements can be achieved through the access junction particularly for a refuse vehicle and a car accessing and egressing at the same time. Amended plans have been received which incorporate footways into the site, linking up to those already existing on Providence Hill, and tactile paving has been proposed to formulate a safe crossing pedestrian point. Please note that there are plans to provide an off-road cycle link along Providence Hill, which would be fronting the site. As such, depending on the timescales of development (if planning permission is approved), it may be that the cycle scheme has progressed to a level that the access junction needs to be amended during the S278 process. Any amendments would also need to consider how the internal footways will link onto the pedestrian / cycle route potentially with upgrades required. <u>Trip Impact</u>

Concerns were previously raised in regard to the potential trip rates associated with the residential and commercial development proposed, and the suitability of the access junction to accommodate the level of vehicle flow without impacting on the A27 Providence Hill. A transport statement has been submitted.

Residential - Utilising the TRICS database of traffic surveys, it has been projected that the residential element of development will generate estimated vehicle movements of 2 arrivals and 6 departures in the AM peak period (08:00-09:00) and 5 arrivals and 3 departures in the PM peak (17:00-18:00) respectively. These figures and considered agreeable.

Veterinary Surgery - whilst the TRICS database was reviewed it was ascertained that no comparable site existed. As such, trip rate information was derived from a potential future user of the site.

This projected data has been reviewed, is considered reasonable and robust, and outlines trip data suggesting that 9 staff will be employed on site at any one time, 3 of which would be vets, and that between 6 and 8 clients would arrive across an average hour. For the peak trip periods, it is therefore suggested that vehicle trip rates would be approximately 13 arrivals and 0 departures in the AM Peak period and 8 arrivals and 9 departures during the PM Peak period.

Combined - this would result in a total development trip rate of:

- 15 arrivals and 6 departures across the AM Peak period; and
- 13 arrivals and 12 departures across the PM Peak period.

In terms of potential highway impact, it is the arrivals into the proposed development site that would be most concerning, given the potential to disrupt vehicle flow on the A27 Providence Hill whilst a vehicle waited to turn right into site across a moving lane.

Having now ascertained projected trip rates in the peak hours however, it is thought unlikely that the additional vehicle movements will have a disruptive impact, certainly not severe. Whilst the peak of arrivals would be 15 in the AM peak period, the reality is that these trips would be split by arrival direction with a proportion turning unobstructed left into site, whilst the remainder would turn right and potentially stop traffic flows.

However, as a worst case scenario, even if all 15 projected vehicle arrivals were to access site with a right hand turn, this would equate to 1 vehicle every 4 minutes across a peak hour which would be acceptable.

Internal Layout

1. Internal visibility splays of 2.4 x 18.0m have been demonstrated on plans, and this is appropriate for an anticipated 15mph vehicle speed. However, for S38 adoption purposes, HCC requires a 20mph vehicle design speed and appropriate visibility splays of 2.4 x 25.0m.

2. Vehicle tracking diagrams have been produced for cars, refuse and emergency vehicles, and these have been reviewed. Whilst adequate space exists internally for two cars to pass, no such drawings have been provided to show that there is adequate space for a refuse vehicle and a car to pass each other. These are required to demonstrate that such movements can be achieved without the need

	to mount footways or similar. A request for such drawings is therefore made. 3. The parking layout of the site appears generally acceptable, with adequately sized bays and 6.0m aisle distances. However, any space against either landscaping or a vertical obstruction should be afforded an additional 0.3m step out strip to ease user movement in and out of the vehicle. Additional, spaces such as that marked '13' on plans should have a footway edging the non-roadsides of the vehicle to enable access for all users. 4. Due to several areas of the site potentially not being directly accessible to refuse vehicles due to the lack of turning head and elongated reversing movement or bin pull, EBC Direct Services Team should be contacted in regard to the potential for a bin collection point provision around the site to ease collection times. 5. No details of levels have been submitted, so this element has not been reviewed. However, this will need to be fully assessed as part of a future S278 / S38 should a permission be granted. 6. The provision of additional footways internal to the site should be investigated to prevent the need to walk in roads, or in the case of the Veterinary Surgery, through the car park, when simple footways to the rear of parking spaces 9-19 would prevent this. 7. The provision of street lighting has not been shown on plans, and this would of course be required for security and safety reasons. 8. The potential for added permeability for the site should also be investigated, such as a pedestrian / cycle route through to Goslings Turning or Oakely Vale. 9. Parking quantum's have not been assessed as this is a function for EBC as Local Parking Authority. However, it is noted that there is a lack of cycle parking, particularly for the Veterinary Surgery.
Flood and Water: (Comments on original plans)	<u>Drainage Strategy</u> This is a full application on a greenfield site located in Flood Zone 1. There is an ordinary watercourse that runs along the northern boundary of the site. The Ground Investigation Report indicates that the site is on Wittering Formation Clay. Infiltration tests were run, and none were successful. Groundwater strikes were also observed between 2.10- 2.75m bgl. Given this, infiltration is not considered viable and it is intended to discharge surface water from the development to the adjacent ordinary watercourse. The drainage strategy involves discharging site flows through a vortex separate, to remove hydrocarbons, before discharging this into a vegetated detention basin controlled via a hydrobrake discharging at the greenfield QBAR rate of 2.5 l/s. Flows are then allowed to pass through a double swale to improve water quality before being discharged into the ditch. Permeable paving will be provided in the parking and driveway areas. Further information is required before making a decision on the application: Identify the body likely to undertake maintenance. Is it intended to be adopted by the local water company, a maintenance company, or another organisation?

	• The micro drainage calculations have not taken account of urban creep. 10% urban creep should be added to the impermeable area not the 'add flows/ climate change' allowance. • The permeable paving located in private driveways and parking areas has not been connected into the wider drainage system. Permeable paving is being used in order to provide some water treatment and attenuation. Given that the permeable paving is located on clay, water will not be able to drain away via infiltration and is likely to just sit and build up in the permeable paving. • Exceedance flow routes show flood waters in an exceedance event being directed at properties, in particular plots 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16. Exceedance flows should be directed around properties (through driveways and Gardens) rather than have water building up against the houses.
Minerals and Waste:	<u>No objection</u> - As the site is below 3ha in size, Hampshire County Council, as the Minerals Planning Authority, do not consider this to be a viable extraction opportunity
Archaeology:	Do not raise any archaeological issues.
Children's Services:	I will not be seeking a financial contribution from this development. The information available indicates this is a development of 16 dwellings and therefore using the agreed child yield ratio it could be expected to generate approximately 5 primary age children and 3 secondary age children, all of which can be educated at the catchment schools.
Other Public Bodies: <i>(summarised)</i>	
Bursledon Parish Council: <i>(Comments on original plans)</i>	<u>Objection</u> While Councillors recognised that this area is on the urban fringe and in the local plan for development, they objected on the following grounds; • As raised by HCC transport report there is insufficient detail to ensure no adverse impact on access to and from the A27, of particular concern as this is an air quality management area. • The imbalance between commercial and residential development on the site raises concerns that parking requirements from the proposed vets practice will cause problems for local residents. • The siting and orientation of the housing is of poor design, particularly plots 3,4 and 5 with gardens backing onto the A27. • the location of buildings appears to impact adversely on the view from the windmill and this requires checking.
Natural England:	<u>Further Information Required:</u> A habitat regulations assessment needs to be undertaken to determine whether the proposal will have significant effects on designed sites. The HRA needs to consider: • The development's effects on total nitrogen and/or total phosphorus nutrient loading within the Solent catchment, including a nutrient budget calculation.

	• Details of proposed mitigation measures to address any nutrient impacts, including appropriately funded management and monitoring, and details of how the measures will be secured for the lifetime of the development. • Consideration of increased recreational use of the Solent SPAs. • Consideration of increased recreational use of the New Forest SPA, SAC, and Ramsar Site. • Any other likely significant effects that could arise from the development should also be assessed. Once the above information is obtained, please consult Natural England on any appropriate assessment your authority may decide to make.
Historic England:	No advice provided
NHS Health Trust:	No response
Other Consultees: <i>(summarised)</i>	
Hampshire Buildings Preservation Trust:	No response
Southampton Airport:	<u>No Objection</u> , subject to condition approving bird management plan for SUDS system.
Southern Water:	General advice provided regarding connection to foul sewer network and sustainable drainage systems.
Southern Gas Network	General advice provided, includes plan showing buried gas main pipe under Providence Hill.
Hampshire Swifts:	In their Phase 1 Habitat Assessment Aven Ecology make no mention of providing any ecological enhancements for the proposed development. Swifts, House Sparrows and Starlings are all now red-listed because they are at high risk of extinction. We recommend the integration of Swift bricks, which are very easy to include into routine building practices and results in a permanent, discrete, maintenance-free biodiversity enhancer which will provide much-needed breeding spaces for declining species of birds.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details:		

Pre-commencement Conditions:	Yes ☐	No ☒
Details:		

Legislation:
Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:- <i>"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."</i> Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

"In considering whether to grant Listed Building Consent for any works, the Local Planning Authority ... shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

Policy:

**National Planning Policy Framework
Planning Practice Guidance**

Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are:

Strategic Policies

S1(Sustainable development),
S2 (Approach to development)
S3 (Location of new housing)
S8 (Historic environment)
S9 (Green Infrastructure)

Development Management Policies

DM1 (General development),
DM2 (Environmentally sustainable development),
DM3 (Climate change),
DM6 (Surface water management),
DM8 (Pollution)
DM10 (Water and waste water),
DM11 (Nature conservation),
DM12 (Heritage assets)
DM13 (Access),
DM14 (Parking),
DM23 (Residential development within urban areas),
DM24 (Creating a mix of housing),
DM28 (Delivering affordable housing),
DM29 (Dwellings with higher access standards),
DM30 (Internal space standards)
DM33 (Provision of recreation and open space facilities with new development)
DM36 (Community, leisure and cultural facilities)
DM38 (Funding infrastructure)

Site Specific Policy: BU1 (Land north of Providence Hill)

An area of 1.1 hectare on the north side of Providence Hill is allocated for residential development of approximately 19 dwellings. Planning permission will be granted provided that detailed proposals accord with the development plan and meet the following specific development requirements:

- a. noise and air quality assessments are undertaken to confirm that the site can be developed satisfactorily for residential purposes given the proximity to the A27;
- b. hydrological surveys are undertaken to identify the extent of the headwater system on site and the hydrological routes that feed the headwater and provide chemical and water quality testing to act as a baseline to monitor impact;
- c. the development incorporates measures to safeguard the adjoining stream and Windmill Woods Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) with 20m undeveloped buffers;

- d. to preserve water quality and flows into the unnamed watercourse to the north of the site details of Sustainable Urban Drainage shall be provided in accordance with policy DM6 as part of any application for outline or full planning permission;
- e. ensure avoidance or mitigation of direct and indirect adverse impacts on habitats or species protected by legislation or identified as of principal importance within the NERC Act 2006 S41 lists and that there is a net gain in biodiversity;
- f. the development provides a high quality landscaped setting which preserves or enhances the special interest, character and appearance of the adjoining Bursledon Windmill Conservation Area and safeguards the setting of the listed windmill;
- g. a new vehicular and pedestrian access is provided from Providence Hill; and
- h. occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of any necessary wastewater network reinforcement, in liaison with the service provider.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

- Quality Places,
- Residential Parking Standards,
- Trees and Development,
- Affordable Housing
- Planning Obligations
- Bursledon Windmill Conservation Area Appraisal.

Assessment:

Principle

The site is located within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable, providing it is in accordance with the relevant planning policies. In this case the proposal would not be in accordance with the site allocation (Policy BU1) as it only accommodates three quarters of the allocated housing (14 of the required 19 dwellings) due to the presence of the veterinary practice.

However, a vets practice (like health care facilities) is an important use that is not actively planned for within the local plan but nevertheless needs to be accommodated. A vets practice does not come under the NPPF definition of main town centre uses, and so it is not necessary to consider the sequential approach to site selection. Indeed, the nature of the vets would not readily work within a town centre location where space is limited and so it is reasonable to consider other sites within the urban edge.

It is noted that a vets practice would bring economic and social benefits to the area, in terms of providing new jobs and offering a wider range/ choice in veterinary services. Due to these benefits, there is considered to be a case for allowing a vets practice onto the site providing that the shortfall in housing numbers is not significant. In which case it is necessary for the scheme to demonstrate that it has made the most efficient use of the allocated housing site while creating a high-quality development.

Amount of Development and Layout

While the principle of a vets practice could be acceptable, the development proposes a very large vets building (approximately 8x the footprint of the individual houses) and includes an associated 19 space car park. The vets practice takes up approximately a third of the developable part of the site, leaving limited room for the residential development and as a result just 14 of the allocated 19 dwellings are squeezed into the eastern part of the site.

Whilst the residential street layout broadly follows that of the previously withdrawn outline application, the dispersal of dwellings on the site is completely different and as a result, while fewer dwellings are proposed than Policy BU1 permits, the cramped nature of the housing development suggests a congested form of development. Indeed, the residential scheme fails to provide any communal recreational or outdoor play space, which would be expected on a development of this size.

Furthermore, there are many instances where the development does not make the most efficient use of the land available, with wasted space between the attenuation pond and housing development and the inclusion of an unnecessarily large landscaping area where plots 1 & 2 used to be. In contrast, there are other parts of the residential development that require more space such as around the attenuation pond to allow a shallower profile. The residential streets also need to be widened in places to allow both decent tree planting to break up the built form and to provide pavements (as there are areas where pedestrian would have to share space with vehicles).

Overall, it is considered that the land take of the vets practice is excessive, and the veterinary practice could be better integrated and reduced in size to allow more of the site to be developed for housing (both in terms of increasing housing numbers and also providing an improved residential environment).

Site Constraints

It is also important to make an efficient use of the site as the actual developable area is heavily constrained by mature boundary trees, along with the requirement to provide a buffer for the adjoining stream and another to allow views through the site to the Grade II* Bursledon Windmill. The development also needs to work with the steeply sloping land formation and provide the residents with protection from the A27 traffic noise. While some attempts have been made by the development to address these issues, serious concerns remain and are fully covered below.

Topography and Landscaping

The site is very steeply sloping with more than a 16m drop in ground levels (from the high point on the site's north-western tip down to its north-eastern end). There is also a significant drop in in ground levels (of around 7m) from Providence Hill down to the stream along the site's northern boundary. While it is inevitable that some retaining structures would be necessary to develop the site, it would be expected that the placement and design of buildings and other structures are first fitted around the natural topography to minimise the use of the retaining walls. One approach would be to design nonstandard bespoke buildings (such as split-level properties) and take a flexible approach to the site layout, which the development fails to do.

Instead, the large vets building and associated car parking area is on one continuous ground level, which has resulted in a greater need for large retaining structures and hard engineering solutions, as opposed to buildings & structures with smaller footprints that can be more easily staggered with the ground levels.

The Applicant has attempted to address the site levels through amended plans. However, rather than adjusting the site layout or design of the vets instead the development relies on hard engineering solutions, which are soften through landscaping. The amended plans recontour the site using a series of retaining structures to step the ground levels down more gradually than the original submission. To achieve this, two houses have been removed (original plots 1& 2 to the east of the vets) and thus reducing the number of dwellings from 16 to 14. While good quality landscaping is welcomed, the actual size of the replacement landscaping area is well over what is necessary to provide screening, and the land could be better utilised on a site where development is already heavily constrained.

Moreover, even with the amended plans, the development still requires a significant amount of cut and fill, with some retaining features being up to 2m or even 3m high in places. Rather than working with the natural ground levels, the development relies on landscaping solutions to screen the visual harm from the extensive engineering works and structures. As such concern is raised that the quality of the development and its setting could be affected in the long term if the landscaping is not well maintained.

Site of Nature Conservation and Sustainable Drainage System

Along the northern side of the site is a stream, which is the headwater that flows into the Windmill Woods Site of Nature Conservation (to the northeast). Policy BU1 requires a 20m development free buffer to be provided for the stream. However, there are lots of instances where the 20m buffer is not achieved, with the vets building, car parking, access road and sustainable drainage feature all well within the buffer.

Furthermore, Policy BU1 requires hydrological surveys to identify the extent of the headwater system on site & the routes that feed the headwater and provide chemical and water quality testing to act as a baseline to monitor impact. While the submission is accompanied by a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy it does not provide sufficient information in relation to the existing headwater.

The Ground Investigation Report indicates that the site is on Wittering Formation Clay, where infiltration is not viable, and so surface water runoff from the development will need to be discharged into the watercourse. The drainage strategy involves discharging site flows through a vortex separate, to remove hydrocarbons, before entering the attenuation pond (controlled via a hydrobrake discharging at the greenfield QBAR rate of 2.5 l/s). Flows are then allowed to pass through a double swale before being discharged into the ditch.

In terms of capacity, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the drainage system is of sufficient capacity to provide for the development. The County Flood and Water Team have requested that the drainage details take account of the runoff from driveways and include a 10% urban creep in the drainage calculations. Further revisions are also needed to reroute of exceedance flows away from properties and maintenance details are required for the drainage system.

In terms of water quality, Policy DM6 requires developments on sites within 100m of headwaters and tributaries draining into a SAC, SuDS schemes to include at least three forms of naturalised filtration. However, the scheme fails to meet this requirement as the two part swale appears to split water flow one way or the other and then come back together, so is only counted as one treatment method. Therefore, the development provides just two of the three forms of naturalised filtration and can not ensure high enough water quality entering the stream.

Another concern is the limited space provided for the attenuation pond, which has been squashed into the far north eastern corner of the site where it has the potential to impact on the root protection area of the mature TPO trees. While it is noted that the additional landscaping, new central island and recontouring is an improvement on the original submission, the attenuation pond is little more than an uninspiring hole in the ground. The attenuation pond is steeply sloping (well above a 1 in 4m slope which the Council would usually look for) and its steep sides will require safety railings. An objection raised by both the Ecology and Landscaping Officers.

Overall, it is considered that the attenuation pond needs more space and should be moved away from the tree roots and be redesigned as an integrated feature which should enhance the appearance of the development, providing both amenity and recreational benefits. The sustainable drainage system also needs to provide sufficient capacity for the development and further enhanced to provide three naturalised forms of filtration to ensure good quality run of water entering the stream.

Character and Appearance

The approach from Providence Hill into the site is relatively poor. On the western side, one is welcomed by a 30m long car parking area, and even with the additional landscaping added, it would still represent an unattractively large area of hard surfacing. The vets building sits behind the car park where it is remote from the public realm and its design bears little relationship to the residential part of the scheme, or the design of other buildings found within the wider locality.

The flat roof and boxy design of the vets building is uninspiring and only emphasises its large scale. The introduction of a stone feature wall, timber cladding and glazing helps to provide some visual interest at the front. However, the red brick on the remainder of the building is bland and the fenestration could be better designed to fit the building.

The vets building is sited next to a footpath linking the neighbouring housing development (The Goslings) to Providence Hill. While the site is heavily screened by mature trees, there will inevitably be some views of the large and incongruous vets building from the public realm, (particularly during the winter when there is less foliage – as demonstrated through the winter key viewpoints provided). As such the large and incongruous vets building will have a detrimental impact on both the appearance of the site and wider public realm.

Overall, the building design for the houses is more successful than the vets, and there is a pleasing variety in housing forms and materials used. The materials make some reference to the local vernacular (particularly the black weatherboarding, brick and plain tiles) and reflect the style of housing at The Goslings to the north. The houses themselves are reasonably well designed, although further interest needs to be added where their side elevations of houses adjoin the public realm.

Bursledon Windmill

The site is the last piece of green lung left on Providence Hill, which provides some credence to the rural setting of the Grade II* listed Bursledon. In line with Policy BU1 a triangular shaped building free buffer has been created in the centre of the site to allow some views towards the Grade II* Bursledon Windmill. However, both the Built Heritage Consultant and Landscape Officer has suggested that the dwellings at Plots 1 & 3 be moved further back to allow a wider vista to be created and more space for street trees to frame the view.

Although a wider treed vista would be preferable, on balance the introduction of the extensive landscaping (where plots 1 and 2 were originally proposed) is considered sufficient to maintain an appropriate green setting for Bursledon Windmill. While the narrow section wedge at the front of the site is dominated by car parking, this is actually set in a dip and therefore is less noticeable compared to the treed section towards the northern end of the site.

Living Accommodation, Traffic Noise and Air Quality

Generally, the dwellings just meet the nationally described internal space standards, and sufficient space is provided between buildings (in order to meet the Council's required separation distances for facing first floor windows).

In terms of private outdoor amenity space, in most cases garden sizes are close to 60% of the dwelling's footprint (as outlined within Quality Places SPD), although it is unclear how the amenity space for the maisonettes will be shared between the two properties as no communal amenity space is provided for the development.

However, concern is raised about the quality of the private amenity spaces as in some cases the retaining walls and ground works cause significant overshadowing. This

includes up to a 2m high retaining structure along the whole depth of the garden at Plot 10 and up to a 3m high retaining structure around the whole of the south facing rear gardens of Plots 12-14. Also of concern is the rear gardens of Plot 1-3 for which site sections have been provided. While the proposed terracing helps to create more usable garden spaces, the 2m-3m rise in ground levels plus the addition of a 2.5m acoustic fence at the high point along the rear boundary will again create significant overshadowing. In all of these cases the land topography and supporting structures will reduce light to the rear gardens and ground floor windows thus making the living spaces less appealing.

Turning to traffic noise and air quality, the site's south-western boundary fronts onto Providence Hill, which is a very busy section of the A27 close to Windover roundabout. Noise and air quality assessments have been submitted, which propose fenestration insulation, acoustic fencing and alternative means of ventilation. The general approach within the assessment has been accepted by the Environmental Health Officer, although further traffic information is required. In addition, contributions would be required to air quality monitoring and mitigation to deal with this issue.

As part of the noise mitigation measures, a 2.5m high acoustic fence is to be installed along a 44m stretch near the front of the site, which presence will have a negative impact on the appearance of the site from Providence Hill and overshadows of the gardens of Plots 1-3. The acoustic fence is mainly required to protect the gardens of Plots 1-3 from traffic noise as they back on to the main road. Instead, the layout should be re-considered with residential gardens positioned away from the main road and sound blocked by buildings, this way the acoustic fencing can be removed or at least minimised.

Car Parking

Turning to car parking, two allocated parking spaces are required for dwellings of up to three bedrooms and three allocated spaces are required for dwelling with four or more bedrooms (to accord with the Council's residential parking standards), plus an additional 20% for visitor parking. The development provides sufficient car parking for all of the houses, in the form of both on plot and marked street parking. Although the road parking for Plot 11 should be brought within its plot boundary to ensure that it is available for these residents. The development also provides the required three unallocated visitor car parking spaces.

However, there is an under-provision of car parking for the four maisonettes (at Plots 2-3 & 8-9), which can only provide seven of the required eight car parking spaces. The plans indicate that these off plot parking spaces would be unallocated, but this isn't an acceptable solution as there would not be sufficient turn over of spaces for unallocated car parking to work for just four units. Furthermore, there would be pressure from the vets' customers to use the unallocated residential car parking spaces (in the event that the vets' car park is full) and so the parking may not always be available for the residents of the maisonettes.

Access and Highways

The site would be accessed via a simple priority junction onto Providence Hill, which is a replication of that previously proposed under the withdrawn outline application. Internal visibility splays of 2.4 x 18.0m have been demonstrated on plans, and this is appropriate for an anticipated 15mph vehicle speed, although visibility splays would need to be increased if the road is to be adopted and this could further impact on existing trees.

Whilst adequate visibility splays are achievable, and an independent Road Safety Audit raised no issue in this regard, it is noted that no two-way vehicle tracking has been provided to show how two-way movements can be achieved through the access junction particularly for a refuse vehicle and a car accessing and egressing at the same time.

In terms of trip rates, the transport assessment estimates a combined trip rate (for the vets and residential development) of 15 arrivals and 6 departures across the AM Peak period & 13 arrivals and 12 departures across the PM Peak period. However, the trip rates are likely to be slightly lower than this as the assessment is based on 16 rather than 14 dwellings. The greatest vehicular movement would be the 15 arrivals in the AM peak period and these would be split by arrival direction (with a proportion turning unobstructed left into site, whilst the remainder would turn right and potentially stop traffic flows). However, as a worst-case scenario, even if all 15 projected vehicle arrivals were to access site with a right hand turn, this would equate to 1 vehicle every 4 minutes across a peak hour, which would be acceptable.

No objection has been raised by the Highways Officer on the site access or projected trips. Although the Highway Officer's suggestions to improve the internal layout of the development should be incorporated into the scheme and cycle storage is required for the vets practice.

Trees

There are a number of existing mature trees along all of the site boundaries, including those along the northern and eastern boundaries, which are protected through tree preservation orders. There are areas of the development that come close to the protected trees and have the potential to impact on their long-term health and retention (such as the vets building and the attenuation pond).

While an arboricultural impact assessment, method statement & tree protection plan have been submitted, these are not based on the proposed levels details, nor retaining structures, and so the extent of the development's impact on trees is not fully assessed within the reports. Furthermore, the arboricultural information does not provide site specific information and the position of the tree protection fencing contains errors (including missing the root protection area for tree T57 and not providing additional space for a veteran tree T23).

In terms of the proposed site access, it is noted that its position matches that of the outline planning permission for which there was a resolution to grant planning permission but the development was later withdrawn by the Applicant. While the position of the access has been accepted in the previous application, the access is within the root protection areas of two category A trees. The arboricultural information therefore needs to provide details of the methods to be used to provide a bridge over the tree roots.

The Tree Officer is concerned that the current proposal will result in a more significant impact on the trees than that specified within the arboricultural information and has raised an objection. Without detailed and accurate arboricultural information, it is possible that the development would cause significant harm to the important trees on the site and the layout and amount of development may have to be revised accordingly.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

The submission is accompanied by an ecological impact assessment (and biodiversity net gain matrix), which outlines baseline ecological conditions, mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures. The assessment was based on a site walk over, review of existing surveys and suggested conditioning future surveys (including a winter pre-commencement badger survey).

The ecological impact assessment set out invasive plant removal; soft-felling for the horse chestnut tree with low bat roost suitability; a wildlife-sensitive lighting scheme; a landscape management and monitoring plan; mitigation/ habitat for nesting birds; timings for vegetation clearance; householder packs to contain information on cat predation of wildlife & inclusion of reptile receptor areas. The development would also be able to incorporate swift, bird and bat boxes.

The information has been reviewed by the Council's Ecology Officer who raised no objection on either ecology or biodiversity net gain grounds. Had the development been recommended for approval then it would have been reasonable to condition approval of a construction environmental management plan, a biodiversity enhancement plan and long-term maintenance/ management details.

Other Considerations

Residential Amenity

The nearest dwellings to the site are those at 4 Brookfield. While the development will be visible from these properties, they will retain a reasonable outlook with the new dwellings to the rear of their gardens on a lower ground level (Plots 12-13). Otherwise, the site is reasonably well screened by mature boundary trees and is not considered to unacceptably impact on the amenity of existing neighbours (by way of a loss of light, outlook or privacy).

Affordable Housing

This would be a qualifying site for affordable housing provision and as such would need to provide 35% of the dwellings as affordable housing. This previously worked out as 6 affordable homes on the 16 units proposed, but now can be reduced to 5 affordable homes based on the amended plans for 14 units. Had the application been recommended for permission then further advice would have been sought from the housing enabling officer to ensure an appropriate mix and tenure for the affordable housing. It would also have been necessary to demonstrate compliance with Building Regulations M4(1) and M4(2) as set out within Policy DM29.

Ground Contamination

The environmental report and desk top study have been reviewed by the Environmental Health Officer and no objection raised subject to further details being approved via condition.

Archaeology

The historical environmental impact assessment has been submitted, which concludes that the archaeology conditions at the site are moderately poor and the likelihood of encountering remains are remote and impacts could be mitigated by a programme of archaeological work secured by a condition. The Archaeology Officer has raised no objection to the development and does not consider additional conditions necessary, based on the fact that archaeological surveys for the two adjoining development areas found very little in the way of archaeological evidence.

Flooding

The site is within flood zone 1 (which has a low risk of flooding) and the information provided within the flood risk assessment is acceptable.

Impact of SPA:

Recreational Disturbance

The site is within both the 5.6km catchment area for the Solent Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site and the 13.8km catchment area for the New Forest Special Protection Area. It is recognised that new housing developments within these catchment areas are likely to result in additional visitors and potential damage to these protected sites. In order to mitigate for these impacts the developer has agreed to pay a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy (which manages visitors to the coastline) and the Council's New Forest Mitigation Strategy (which provides Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces within the borough). No contribution has been received to date.

Nutrients

The site is within the impact zone for nitrogen, which has been shown to have a determinantal impact on the water quality of the Southampton and Solent Water Special Protection Area. A nutrient budget has not been submitted for the development (which based on the greenfield site would show a positive output for nitrogen from the development). No mitigation has been provided for the increase in nutrients caused by the housing development.

Insufficient information has been provided to allow the council to complete a habitat regulations assessment, which would have been required had the application been recommended for permission. However, without appropriate mitigation the development is considered to have a likely detrimental impact on the Special Protection Area, both in terms of recreational disturbance and an increase in nutrients.

Planning Obligations:

In accordance with Policies DM28, DM33 & DM38 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), the Council's Planning Obligations & Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Documents and the Community Infrastructure Regulations, there is a requirement for planning obligations to ensure on and off-site provision for facilities and infrastructure made necessary by the development, and to mitigate against any increased need/pressure on existing facilities. Had the application been recommend for permission a full list of planning obligations would need to be agreed with the Applicant and secured via a section 106 agreement.

Equalities Act:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty.

Section 149 (1) states:

A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups.

It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF and development plan do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and emerging plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Emerging Local Plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

The NPPF aims for the need for housing to be met, and Policy S2 of the Adopted Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. The NPPF and Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Adopted Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

Conclusion:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐**REFUSE** ☒

Comments ...