

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/22/94034

Site Address: Moorhill, Moorhill Road, West End, Southampton, SO30 3AY

Case Officer: Summer Sharpe

Description: Proposed 70-bed care home (Use Class C2); associated access, parking, landscaping, sustainable drainage, electricity sub-station, other structures and works; following demolition and clearance of the existing site.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Countryside - A small section of the site is subject to surface water flooding - Flood Zone 1 - Solent Mitigation & Disturbance Zone - Tree Preservation Order (200-E) - Airport safeguarding - Archaeological area (north of the site) - Existing recreation, allotment and open space (east) - Telegraph Woods Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) (east) - Mineral safeguarding (south) - Former Settlement Gap (Area C - West End, Hedge End, Southampton) (south & east) (Sub-Area C9 comprises Telegraph Woods, C10 comprises the Southern Water Reservoir).		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Planning App no.	Proposal	Decision
Z/32450/000/00	Removal of existing close boarded and metal railing fence and replacement with new close boarded fence with realignment of vehicular access.	Permitted (February 1992)
F/20/87694	Erection of two-storey five-bedroom dwelling with carport and associated works following demolition of existing dwelling.	Permitted (July 2020)

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>3no. objections summarised as follows:</u> (a) over development, (b) limited vehicular access, (c) inadequate parking, (d) no space for visitors/ contractors/ refuse collection, (e) A27 is a primary route with heavy traffic flow, (f) existing buildings are not similar or in-keeping, (g) pollution/ noise, (h) water pollution, (i) landscaping should be beneficial, (j) visually obtrusive, (k) access, and (l) overlooking. <u>1no. Comment/Concern:</u> (a) access/ road safety		
Parish Council:	No objection – However, Councillors have asked that more parking provision be made available. That an ICB report be provided and that capital contributions be made towards healthcare in the Village.		
Hampshire Highways:	<u>Comments 20 February 2023 (following additional information):</u> The plan (drawing 3127-HIA-XX-22-DR-A-0101) is largely a copy of the initial version, but now includes a footway provision from the site building through to the existing footway on the local highway network. This is welcomed, as		

previously the footway provision stopped at the site access bellmouth. With this provision in place, there is no objection to the proposals from a highway perspective, subject to the following developer contributions and conditions being secured.

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS:

For the above reasons, whilst there would be no objection to the proposals from a highway impact perspective, a Highways Developer Contribution would be requested. This would be for an initial £26,000 and would likely be allocated to:

1. Real Time Information at local bus stops;
2. Bus shelter improvements such as drop down seating at local bus stops; and
3. Pedestrian improvements such as the provision of missing drop kerbs and tactile paving.

Additionally, it would be requested that a further contribution of £6,000 is secured in order to implement Traffic Regulation Orders required as a result of the development proposals. These would primarily be parking restrictions within the bell-mouth access junction area to prevent obstructive parking that may affect movement and visibility. Onwards, there would need to be updates to the existing TRO in the form of amendments to the 'to be closed' access and the continuation of the existing parking restrictions across this.

Comments 26 November 2023:

No objection in principle, subject to consideration of elements as outlined below, along with the provision of planning conditions should the application be permitted.

ACCESS: In terms of vehicle access, there are currently two access points available from Moorhill Road, one to the north and one to the south of the western edge of the site. The proposals are to formally close up the southern access, returning it to grass verge with raised kerbs, and to provide adjustments to the northern access with a slight relocation, widening, and footway works being undertaken. Drawings have demonstrated that from a planning perspective these proposals are acceptable, with adequate visibility splays being achievable and CAD autotrack drawings showing how the various types of vehicles accessing the site can do so without issue.

In terms of pedestrian access, a section of footway is proposed on Moorhill Road, with tactile paving indicating a safe and visible position for pedestrians to cross in and out of site and onwards reach wider facilities. It is however noted that this footway shows as starting very close to the junction point of the site and Moorhill Road, and as such pedestrians will need to walk in the bell-mouth junction before accessing it. It would be recommended that the developer increases the length of footway, bringing it further into site where it can be reached away from traffic movements. Given the age group

primarily involved in the development (the elderly) who are likely to have slower mobility, this could be beneficial. The developer should however be made aware that subsequent to any planning permission that may be granted by EBC as Local Planning Authority, a S278 approval will onwards be required from HCC as Local Highway Authority prior to implementation of any works.

INTERNAL SITE LAYOUT: Given the nature of the development proposals, the roads and footways relating to this application are not being offered for adoption by the developer. As such, HCC would not in principle object to the proposals. However, it would be advisable that the developer ensures that the internal roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice, and that an appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues.

Having reviewed plans however, the following comments are made:

1. The parking layout looks acceptable with adequately sized parking bays (uplifted appropriately for parallel bays) and adequate aisle widths to allow for easy on site turning. However, it would be recommended that 0.3m hard surfaced step out strips are added to the sides of parking spaces located against landscaping. Without this, landscaping will be stepped upon and likely turn to mud in wet weather, and the usefulness of parking spaces may be affected particularly for those with mobility issues. In terms of parking quantum, this is for EBC to consider in their role as Local Parking Authority.
2. As outlined above, the provision of an internal footway which onwards links into the proposed external footway on Moorhill Road should be investigated. This will negate the need for pedestrians to walk within the proposed bell-mouth area when arriving or leaving the site by foot.

SERVICING: CAD Autotrack drawings have been supplied which demonstrate adequate space is afforded for service vehicles (i.e. refuse trucks) to access the site, turn and reverse into service bays, and onwards leave in a forward gear which is acceptable.

TRIP GENERATION:

In terms of trip generation, as outlined in the supporting Transport Statement, an additional 112 vehicle trips on the local highway network would be anticipated as result of the development proposals. In terms of peak hour impacts however, it is anticipated that given the development proposed 10 of these would be anticipated in the AM Peak (7 in / 4 out, less one existing trip) and 11 in the PM peak (3 in / 7 out, plus rounding). Whilst overall, cumulative with other development proposals, there will be impacts on the local highway network, and infrastructure that requires upgrading, in

	terms of PM impacts, this would be negligible, particularly when considered against existing flow rates. DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS: For the above reasons, whilst there would be no objection to the proposals from a highway impact perspective, a Highways Developer Contribution would be requested. This would be for an initial £26,000 and would likely be allocated to: 1. Real Time Information at local bus stops; 2. Bus shelter improvements such as drop down seating at local bus stops; and 3. Pedestrian improvements such as the provision of missing drop kerbs and tactile paving. Additionally, it would be requested that a further contribution of £6,000 is secured in order to implement Traffic Regulation Orders required as a result of the development proposals. These would primarily be parking restrictions within the bellmouth access junction area to prevent obstructive parking that may affect movement and visibility. Onwards, there would need to be updates to the existing TRO in the form of amendments to the 'to be closed' access and the continuation of the existing parking restrictions across this. CONDITIONS: Should the Case Officer be minded to permit the application conditions are recommended in relation to; closing the existing access, access provision and a CEMP.
EBC Contaminated Land:	<u>Comments 22 November 2022:</u> We have reviewed the appended report by Omnia Ltd, entitled Phase I-II Geo-Environmental Site Assessment, reference A11641/1.1 dated August 2022, and have the following comments: The report reviews the historical uses on and adjacent to the site and presents the results of testing for ground contamination and ground gases. The assessment of land contamination risks to future occupiers of the site has been carried out on the basis that no consumption of home grown produce (fruit and vegetables) will occur, should this change in the future, then the risk assessment would need to be revisited to ensure that levels of chemicals in soil are such that this can occur safely. Whilst little development other than residential is reported to have occurred on site, the report notes adjacent land uses which have the potential to impact this site. Namely the development of reservoirs nearby and former gravel pits and electricity sub stations. On site demolition has occurred with evidence of uncontrolled uses, including fly tipping and burning of waste. An above ground oil tank is present on site, however its purpose is not explained. The report's author identifies potential risks from soil contamination and from ground gases. Testing of soils for chemical contaminants does not show exceedances of the generic screening criteria for residential

	use without consumption of home grown produce. Levels of hydrocarbon compounds were detected at levels above background in the vicinity of the oil tank and elsewhere on site. Asbestos testing did not report the presence of fibrous asbestos, however it is not clear what testing of the suspected demolition rubble stockpiles was included. Testing for ground gases has been carried out, however the tabulated results are not included in the report. The assessment of ground gases reported indicates that no particular gas protection measures are required, based on the low gas screening value, GSV, obtained, and the building being Type B (managed apartments- in that there will be central building management control of any alterations to the building or its uses). Elevated levels of carbon dioxide measured are not considered sufficient to raise the GSV to CS2. The report author advises that soil test data indicates little potential for ground gas generation from made ground encountered on site. Whilst we do not disagree that the site likely has a low ground gas risk, we are concerned that the sampling of ground gas on site would not have been able to detect gas in the made ground as the response zone of the boreholes does not appear to encounter this strata. Similarly, consideration of the gas generation potential of the soil and made ground on site should be more rigorous and follow approaches such as CL:aire RB17, which outlines an approach for dealing with sites with low gas risk in a robust way. Notwithstanding the concerns raised above we do not object to the proposed development (restricted as described above with respect to consumption of produce grown on site and management of the dwellings), we do, as we have explained, have reservations about aspects of the site investigation and risk assessment. Given the uncontrolled uses which have occurred on site, the findings of the soil assessment and our concerns about the rigour of ground gas assessment, we would recommend that if permission is granted it should be conditioned to ensure that the site end use is controlled as described and that the site investigation report shortcomings are satisfactorily addressed, we also consider that a discovery strategy for unexpected contamination encountered during development would also be prudent. Should the updated site report and assessment determine that mitigation measures are required these should be agreed with the LPA, along with verification procedures and the requirement for a validation report. Where imported soils are to be utilised on site these should also meet with the approval of the LPA prior to their use on site.
EBC Environmental Health:	<u>Comments 23 November 2022:</u> The proposed site layout benefits from set back from the heavily trafficked A27 Moorhill Road. The applicant has submitted a noise assessment report reference 784-B029375 dated October 2022 and has referred to residential or dwelling noise limits from BS8233 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings". This we consider is a minimum standard but because we are not

	able to advise on noise impacts to residents with care or medical needs, we advise the applicant to consider these and ask its acoustic consultant for assistance. Noise for example can adversely impact on the ability with dementia to interpret and understand their surroundings. Noise can come from various sources within the building such as building services, from other rooms and breaking in from the exterior environment (road traffic noise for example). A road traffic noise survey was carried out and the results have been used to check or calibrate noise predictions to a five-decibel variance in short term observation (attended) to one decibel over a 'long term' (six days). Meteorological conditions were observed as conducive to environmental noise measurement. During the short-term measurements survey generator noise was observed nearby as well as road traffic noise. Taking into consideration fenestration sound insulation, noise levels inside the development with windows closed are mostly less than daytime and evening average limits BS8233 advises for dwellings. At night, maximum noise events exceed mostly comply. Of course, for a mechanically ventilated building, a suitable specification for fenestration façade sound insulation is feasible and the noise assessment report sets referring to the BS8233 limits for dwellings. Noise levels in outdoor amenity areas are mostly compliant with the upper limit we advise for dwellings. We advise the applicant to ask its acoustic consultant about needs for residents with care or medical needs. It appears from drawing 3127-HIA-01-ZZ-DR-A-2701 "Proposed Roof Plan" dated 23 August 2022 plant such as for ventilation will be located on the roof. As neighbouring dwellings are at some distance, we expect noise is controllable to comply with our Rating Level limit of five decibels below the Background Sound Level. Details of controls have not been provided at this time, but controls are more likely to be greater to protect the development itself. Regarding the kitchen, this must also of course be designed to control odours, fumes and noise impacting the development itself in the first instance. We refer to the EMAQ+ publication "Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems". The proposed electrical substation is shown to be enclosed by masonry walling which should help to reduced exposure to electromagnetic radiation. We advise the applicant to check the exposure to future site occupiers from this and cables. Regarding artificial lighting (exterior lights and interior light escape from windows), we advise consideration of lighting
--	---

	colour to be warm, not exceeding 3000 kelvin (K) or lower if required by ecology colleagues. A construction environmental management plan will be necessary to prevent adverse impact to neighbouring dwellings from works including demolition.
EBC Landscape:	<u>Comments 23 November 2022:</u> No objection in principle, however additional information would be requested. The site was previously developed but any buildings have been demolished and the site is vacant. The site is not within a Conservation Area, there is an area TPO on the site. The site is within designated Countryside and abuts a SINC which covers the N part of Telegraph Woods and the N reservoir. This is a sensitive site within Countryside and adjacent a SINC and landscape considerations will be fundamental to the success of the development. It appears the design team understand the importance of the landscape setting and we would expect the delivered landscape to be of a high standard. Policy S5 of the adopted Local Plan states that any development in the Countryside should avoid adversely impacting the character of the landscape. The proposal must therefore ensure the landscape proposals deliver robust Green Infrastructure (GI) across the site. This includes the protection and enhancement of existing screening vegetation. Areas to be addressed: a/ Visual impact – further details and clearer presentations with annotations. Viewpoints 1 & 6 are the key close views, and these should be carefully considered. More distance potential viewpoints have not yet been covered and these should also be checked, and photographs submitted. I anticipate some possible longer distance views from the E, especially as a 3-storey building is proposed. b/ Proposed Site Plan - Whilst I defer to the Tree Officer for comments regarding existing trees, I note that some parking bays lie within the RPZ of retained trees. These should be a low impact, permeable solution such as reinforced gravel with a pinned steel edger, instead of block paving. Any trees removed should be replaced on an a 2 for 1 basis min. Parking bays 22 & 23 are too close to a grade B Sweet Chestnut and should be relocated to the E. Please use reinforced gravel ('Nidagravel' or similar) on as many of the parking bays as possible. This product is sufficiently robust for commercial applications. c/ The landscape treatment along the Moorhill Road frontage is particularly key and further detail is required here of the hedge planting. Is this a native hedge? Evergreen? Will this have a post and rail or railings in front

	to define the boundary? This must be delivered as a robust screen to the development and should be planted at a min. of 1.5m high for immediate impact/ screening. Since the hedge is under the canopies of existing trees it will require drip irrigation until established (min 2 years after planting). There is a lack of buffer planting to the N SINC at present with only ground flora indicated - additional shade tolerant boundary understorey/hedge planting is required here. d/ The tree planting shown within the parking area is welcomed but there is space for additional trees to the W of bay 1 and to the E of bay 16. A low clipped hedge (1m max.) could run along the centre of the planting area between bays 1-3 and bays 4-9 as per the snapshot below. This will help filter lower-level views of parked cars. The hedge should link with the frontage hedge to extend wildlife corridors. e/ Proposed soft landscape treatment at G.L. below retained trees - will any areas of existing ground cover be retained? f/ The proposed sub-station is in a relatively visible location. This should be enclosed by either/and an attractive hard landscape screen/robust planting. g/ Additional planting, including a new tree, should be included between the sub-station and bike store. h/ What boundary fence detail is proposed along the N boundary from the CBF to the rear garden up to Moorhill Road? (same query along S boundary) j/ Please add planting to soften the line of the CBF that encloses the rear garden where it can be seen from frontage areas (same applies if a welded mesh fence is used instead). k/ The overall concept for the rear garden area is acceptable but I have the following comments: • The number of new trees should be increased significantly to ensure provision of robust GI and to bolster the adjacent SINC. • Further buffer planting is required along the entire E boundary to the SINC. This could take the form of a native mix hedgerow. I assume a CBF is proposed here. The infiltration basins may need to be re-jigged slightly to make space for the new hedge. • What is the intention along the S boundary? An exposed CBF is not acceptable. • The central courtyard - the focal tree will be a key feature and should be a larger canopy species to balance the bulk of the new building. • The infiltration basins need further work to avoid being sterile engineering shapes that appear little more than a 'hole in the ground'. A more natural varied shape would be welcomed. The safety fencing around these will be
--	--

	visually intrusive and requires significant planting to soften all views. Can the S basin could be pulled off the boundary to the SINC someway and possibly relocated closer to the SE corner (depends on the exact extent and quality of the retained vegetation here?) and can the N basin be pushed further N if the line of the CBF follows the red line here? At the moment the arrangement around the basins is somewhat squeezed. l/ Deacon Design Landscape General Arrangement Plan. There is a discrepancy between the site plan and this landscape drawing ref. boundary treatments. The symbol for railings and palisade appears the same on the landscape plan? The 1.8m metal palisade fence should be replaced with a steel welded mesh fence, finished in dark grey or black NOT green. A welded mesh fence is not acceptable around the frontage areas where secure boundaries are not required for residents. Estate railings or a post & rail timber fence is preferred. Please accurately plot existing native woodland planting to be retained (separate from proposed woodland planting) so it is clear what is to be kept. Where wildflower turf is indicated, will this be maintained as long mown grass, in which case, perhaps a mown margin along edges of paths will be required for neatness? See comment above regarding the importance of a continuous planted buffer along the sensitive boundaries to the SINC (to the N & E). See comments above regarding location, design and fencing around infiltration basins. Further work required to ensure the basins are not an eyesore and that potential ecological gains maximised. The basins & fencing should be softened with medium/tall shrub planting. Maximise opportunities for new tree planting to bolster GI. There are locations available for further new trees. Further design details of the proposed rain gardens are required. m/ Whilst I defer to the Urban Design Officer regarding the scale and detailed design of the proposed care home, I would recommend that at least some of the roof scape is green roof for added habitat value. In addition, if any roof terraces/gardens are proposed further details are required. I note on the roof plan indicative roof plant areas. Further detail is required to ensure that this does not lead to increased visual impact. n/ Please supply details of all proposed external lighting. p/ Please supply drainage and services drawings to ensure no conflicts with proposed tree planting. q/ Please confirm that existing/proposed levels do not require any retaining structures/walls. r/ Consider some low, natural mounding in this central 'island' area for added interest.
--	--

	In summary, some significant changes are required to the layout and design. Should planning permission be granted, all hard and soft landscape details to be conditioned, including a landscape maintenance plan, landscape specification plus a condition requiring 5-year replacement of any failed planting.
NHS:	Whilst we recognise that not all the occupants of the proposed care home will be new to the area, we make the Health Care planning assumption that this application will generate up to 70 high acuity additional residents. The resulting growth in local population will inevitably seek registration with a local GP surgery and place additional pressure on existing NHS services; NHS services in primary, community and secondary care settings. Our estimate on the level of additional demand will be placed on NHS Primary Care does not, in our view, warrant the commissioning of an additional GP surgery. The increased demand will be accommodated by the existing GP surgeries open to new registration requests from people living in the area of the proposed development. However, additional capacity for the practices will be required. The ICB considers that the application should be required to make an appropriate financial contribution to the capital investment that the NHS will make in this regard. The proposed contributions formula for developments under 2000 dwellings is: Number of additional residents (70) divided by average list site (1800) x 16 (size of consultation room) x 375 (cost of rent and other additional expenses with regard to premises) x 20 (number of years expected on a lease). This means that the Clinical Commissioning Group will be looking for a contribution of £4,666 for planning gain for health.
EBC Countryside:	The plans show a 1.8m high metal palisade fence along the site boundary with Telegraph Woods keeping the site secure from public access. The plans also show infiltration ponds on the site boundary. I assume water will be directed into these ponds and then seep downhill into Telegraph Woods. There is a network of footpaths in the woodland and I'd like to seek re-assurance that the ground conditions will not change in this area and affect the paths. I understand the Ecology Team have some concerns and are commenting on the layout of the scheme and its proximity to the woodland edge.
EBC Arboriculturalist:	<u>Comments 8 December 2022:</u> The site contains a significant belt of trees to the south, along the road frontage (both within the site and on the verge) and along the northwest. Part of the site is covered by an Area TPO. It should also be noted that there are two designated SINC in close proximity to the site, but we will defer to the Ecology Officer on this matter.

	We had initial concerns regarding sightlines for the entrance, but it appears that the large pine tree is just outside of the proposed sightlines. As we have no speciality in this area, we will defer to the Highways Officer to determine accuracy, but this is critical because if the tree does sit within the sightlines, then it will be vulnerable to removal even if it is not proposed at the planning stage. Further, why has the entrance been moved slightly to the north when one already existed? It may have a logical explanation, but it means that T39 is removed (a B category sweet chestnut) and exposes a potential issue with T41 – a 3rd party tree. We have concerns regarding the dominance of trees to south and, to a lesser extent, from shading. We feel that the positions of the trees relative to the structure will put unnecessary post-development pressure of the trees to be further pruned. The successful use of cellular confinement for the car park and entrance must be demonstrated before it is agreed. A number of car parking spaces are well within the RPAs of tree and collectively could impact the important arboricultural feature significantly. In addition, the report states that this area around T41 will be hand dug, but we will require a contingency plan to be provided if significant roots are found in this area (assuming the entrance stays as per the plans). Finally, the report states that “8 (eight) ‘U’ Grade trees (Trees 21, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32 and 38) located within the site will be removed regardless of any proposed design layouts”, but unless planning permission is forthcoming, their removal will be subject to the TPO Regulations.
EBC Policy:	Moorhill is outside the urban edge and identified as countryside on the Policies Map. Policy S5 in the adopted Local Plan applies to any proposed development on this site. The site was formerly within the local gap separating West End, Hedge End and Southampton. As part of the preparation of the Local Plan, gaps were reassessed to consider whether all the land included met the function of gaps and if any updates were required to reflect recent development and sites with planning permission. It was proposed to remove this area as it does not contribute to the gap function. This site is now outside the designated gap. Policy S5(1) sets out the uses appropriate in the countryside and S5(2) provides criteria for new development in these uses. Appropriate uses include replacement dwellings in accordance with policy DM26. This also applies to residential institutions and the proposed C2 development is therefore appropriate, subject to meeting criteria on the impact of the development. For replacement dwellings, policy DM26 requires residential development to not be disproportionate in size to the existing building; to be within the curtilage; and to be on the

	same footprint unless there are environmental and/or access benefits from an alternative location within the curtilage. This is a cleared site, previously occupied by a single detached dwelling. As the proposal is to replace the former single dwelling with a 70-bed care home, it will be significantly larger than the previous building on the site. The adopted Local Plan includes a policy promoting suitable accommodation for older people including specialist accommodation providing it meets three criteria (policy DM25). These are that the accommodation is in sustainable location with good access to public transport; close to local facilities that residents can use; and well-integrated in the local community. Depending on the public transport provision and level of mobility of the residents, facilities such as shops and doctors in West End may be reasonably accessible (as they are within a mile). This site is outside of the urban edge, on the edge of the settlement and it is set back from Moorhill Road. While it is not in an isolated location, it is not well integrated in accordance with the policy. The scale of the proposed development and its location ensure that it is contrary to adopted Local Plan policy. However, it is recognised that there is a need for older peoples' accommodation in the borough and this proposal involves the reuse of a vacant site for this use. It is also noted that the application has addressed design issues raised by the Council previously and that no objection has been raised in the Urban Design response. Providing that the case officer is satisfied that there are no adverse impacts on the character of the area, the proposal meets the general principles for development in the countryside in policy S5 and Planning Policy does not object to this development.
Southern Water:	Please see the attached extract from Southern Water records showing the approximate position of public foul sewer and public water distribution main and trunk main within the development site. The exact position of the public assets must be determined on site by the applicant in consultation with Southern Water, before the layout of the proposed development is finalised. It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site. Our initial investigations indicate that Southern Water can provide foul sewage disposal to service the proposed development. Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. The supporting documents make reference to drainage using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).

	Under certain circumstances SuDS will be adopted by Southern Water should this be requested by the developer. Where SuDS form part of a continuous sewer system, and are not an isolated end of pipe SuDS component, adoption will be considered if such systems comply with the latest Design and Construction Guidance. Where SuDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long-term maintenance of the SuDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system, which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage system. Thus, where a SuDS scheme is to be implemented, the drainage details submitted to the Local Planning Authority should: - Specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDS scheme. - Specify a timetable for implementation. - Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development. This should include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. The submitted drainage layout shows proposed soakaways within the 5 meters distance from the public water main which is not acceptable to Southern water. No new soakaways should be located within 5 metres of a public or adoptable gravity sewer, rising main or water main. The applicant should be advised that a wastewater grease trap should be provided on the kitchen waste pipe or drain installed and maintained by the owner or operator of the premises. It should be noted that under the Water Industry Act 1991 it is an offence to throw, empty, turn or permit to be thrown or emptied or to pass into any drain or sewer connecting with a public sewer any matter likely to injure the sewer or drain or to interfere with the free flow of its contents.
EBC Housing:	As this is a C2 proposed development it would not trigger an affordable housing requirement therefore I would not have any comments to make from our perspective.
Natural England:	<u>Comments 17 March 2023:</u> <u>Recreational Impacts to Solent SPAs and to the New Forest Designated Sites</u> We note that contributions to mitigate recreational disturbance have been ruled out during the Appropriate Assessment (AA) for both Solent SPA's and the New Forest designated sites, due to the nature of the development as a care home. It is for yourselves as competent authority to be satisfied that the justification for the discount outlined within the AA is enough to remove all reasonable scientific doubt that an adverse impact on integrity on Solent SPAs and the New Forest is removed.

Deterioration of the water environment

A nutrient budget calculator for the Solent was released on 20 April 2022.

We note that an alternative occupancy figure of 0.9 has been used in the calculation based on the estimated and periodic room renovations between occupants. It is Natural England's view that competent authorities may choose to adopt bespoke calculations for detailed planning applications, if sound evidence is available. These are matters for each competent authority. In this case Natural England would recommend a precautionary approach that recognises the uncertainty.

The remainder of the nutrient budget for this application has been calculated in line with the updated Nutrient Neutrality Methodology. The proposed development will be served by Portswood Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTWs). If this situation changes, a reassessment of the nutrient calculation will be required, and a revised Habitats Regulations Assessment will be necessary.

Your authority has measures in place to manage potential impacts through contributions to an agreed strategic solution which we consider to be ecologically sound. Natural England is of the view that if these measures, including contributions to them, are implemented, they will be effective and reliable in preventing harmful effects on the Habitats Site(s) for the duration of the proposed development.

This advice is provided on the basis that all mitigation measures will be secured as planning conditions or obligations by your authority to ensure their strict and timely implementation for the full duration of the development. Your authority should be assured that proposed financial contribution rates are proportionate to the identified effects of the proposed development, suitably precautionary, and in line with the Retail Price Index, where relevant.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)

The above impacts on Habitats sites (SAC/SPA) may also impact SSSIs. Please note that if your authority is minded to grant planning permission contrary to the advice in this letter, you are required under Section 28I (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to notify Natural England of the permission, the terms on which it is proposed to grant it and how, if at all, your authority has taken account of Natural England's advice. You must also allow a further period of 21 days before the operation can commence.

In addition, Natural England would advise on the following issues:

Surface water drainage

	Details of a surface water drainage strategy (SuDS) are provided in the supporting Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy (Paul Basham Associates Ltd, October 2022). Best practice SuDS should be designed and installed in accordance with the requirements in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753). Please note, the pollution hazard indices in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) relate to 'protected waters' with regards to drinking water supply. Step 3 under Section 26.7.1 of the SuDS manual outlines that the requirement for extra treatment should be considered in relation to discharge to environmentally protected sites. It states that 'an additional treatment component (i.e. over and above that required for standard discharges), or other equivalent protection, is required that provides environmental protection in the event of an unexpected pollution event or poor system performance'. The detailed design of a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) should be submitted and agreed with Eastleigh Borough Council. This should include evidence to show that the proposed SuDS scheme will ensure there will be no deterioration in water quality [or changes in water quantity] in discharges from the site. Information on the long-term management and maintenance (including funding) of the SuDS for the lifetime of the development should also be secured prior to the commencement of any works. <u>Construction Environmental Management Plan</u> This application site is in close proximity to Telegraph Woods Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Natural England advise best practice is employed during the construction phase to avoid impacts on the SINC. For example, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) can be submitted to and approved in writing by the council's ecologist/biodiversity officer that identifies the steps and procedures that will be implemented to avoid or mitigate constructional impacts on species and habitats. The CEMP should include the following impacts: • Storage of construction materials/chemicals and equipment; • Dust suppression • Chemical and/or fuel run-off from construction into nearby watercourse(s) • Waste disposal • Noise/visual/vibrational/lighting impacts The approved CEMP can be secured via an appropriately worded condition attached to any planning consent and shall be adhered to at all times, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. <u>Comments 16 January 2023:</u> Further information is required.
Environment Agency:	None received.

EBC Conservation:	<u>Comments 13 February 2023:</u> The new windows in the north-west corner of the west elevation enliven this expanse of brickwork and the change to clear glass for the balustrades lightens the elevations allowing the eye to comprehend better the various depths of the facades giving greater articulation of the mass. Both improvements, still no objection. <u>Comments 15 November 2022</u> No objection - being on its own opposite mainly 1930's dwellings with woodland behind and clear grassed areas to either side, this site will have a pleasant rural feeling while being close to other dwellings on the edge of a settlement, so convenient for staff access. The revised plan form is a great improvement on the initial idea, with the majority of rooms now benefiting from the southerly aspect with its 'arms' around the south facing open courtyard giving shelter for extended comfortable use of the outside area. The eastern wing is now at an angle greater than 90 degrees producing further interest in the form of the building. The combination of vertical timber-style cladding over brickwork of two colours and two different bonds, together with both vertical and horizontal stepping of the elevations, gives interest and articulation resulting in a building whose presence will belie its volume. Conclusion: This scheme will help meet the evidential need for care home places in the area with a well-articulated low maintenance envelope housing 70 residents in a building that does not have the appearance of doing so and has the benefit of a rural outlook on the edge of a settlement without impinging on any historical assets.
HCC Minerals & Waste:	None received.
EBC Ecology:	<u>Comments 13 June 2023:</u> The landscape general arrangement plan has moved the southern most infiltration basin out of the 20m SINC buffer zone and relocated the path and seating out of the buffer zone. The deeper end of the northern infiltration basin is out of the SINC buffer zone, and two rain gardens will be located next to the building. The location of these SuDs features are now acceptable. The retention of existing vegetation and infill of any gaps in the vegetation to make a strong habitat corridor along the southern boundary is supported. The drainage and SuDs management and maintenance strategies are acceptable. A CEMP, BEMP, planting plan and lighting plan can be conditioned. <u>Comments 20 April 2023:</u> The inclusion of the SuDS features wholly within the SINC buffer zone is not appropriate. In effect, this eliminates the purpose of the SINC buffer zone, which is to protect the

	SINC from disturbance and hydrological changes. This should be a naturalised buffer, free from all development. The Landscape General Arrangement Plan and the Landscape Illustrative Plan shows the two SuDS ponds and the self-binding gravel path with seating features within the entire width of the SINC buffer zone and adjacent to the eastern SINC boundary. This is not a naturalised buffer zone. Compromises of development close to the northern buffer can be considered (SINC boundary), but not the eastern boundary. It might be possible to have a small part of a SuDS basin encroaching within the western-most area of a 20m SINC buffer zone, but it is not acceptable for them to occupy the locations shown on these plans. This three-storey building also has potential shading issues for the vegetation in the SINC buffer and the SINC. The inclusion of pathways, the bin store and parking under retained trees will lead to removal of tree limbs to accommodate construction and maintenance of these features. The change in orientation of the building between the pre-app and the full application and the modification of the shape which enlarged the internal courtyard, decreased the amount of area available for the SINC buffer even further. This development is not appropriate due to the increase size of the building and lack of an appropriate SINC buffer to Telegraph Woods SINC. <u>Comments 11 January 2023:</u> Objection - contrary to Local Plan policy DM 11 and represents and overdevelopment of the site. Telegraph Woods SINC is located to the east of the site and West End Covered Reservoir SINC is located to the north. TPO protected trees are located on the southern and western boundaries of the site. To avoid impact on the Telegraph Woods SINC and the West End Covered Reservoir SINC a 20m buffer, free of all development from the woodland canopy edge of the SINC boundary would be required. Whilst this appeared to be achievable in the pre-application, this proposed building, the bin and cycle stores, garden paths and SuDS features are shown right up to the northern edge of the site, leaving no buffer at all. The eastern end of the site plan shows 2 SuDS infiltration basins and garden paths very close to the site boundary. The SINC buffer zones are not sufficient. The proposal at present is contrary to DM11. The Landscape Illustrative plan for the current proposal also shows several parking spaces under tree canopies along the northern boundary and along the western and southern edges of the proposed car park. This will most
--	--

certainly in future require excessive works to the trees as they age and the possibility of branches falling on cars increases. The Bat Survey Report by TetraTech (August 2022) states that two bat activity surveys were done on tree TN31 which is the only tree which has moderate bat roost potential and is proposed to be removed. No bats were recorded roosting at that time. These results will be considered valid until 31 August 2023 after which time additional review will be required. If the tree is to be removed, recommendations for soft felling under ecological supervision were provided in the report. This can be conditioned, however if any signs of bats are found at that time all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist must be called for advice. The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment by TetraTech (October 2022) is based on the current proposal. It will need to be redone after the appropriate SINC buffers have been applied to the development.

SuDS

The Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy by Paul Basham Associates (October 2022) proposes the runoff from the building roof shall drain via infiltration through basins 1 and 2 located in the northeast and southeast corners of the site. The roof run-off that is being taken into the southern Basin will flow via lined rain gardens located in the landscaped areas around the southeast corner of the building. Meanwhile, runoff from the carparks and a portion of the building will drain via infiltration crates installed below the carparks. A catchpit has been specified upstream of the crates to reduce the build-up of silt in the crates and enable infiltration to also take place at the base of the crates. There is a small portion of the site that is at risk of long-term flooding from surface water, located near to the southern boundary. To mitigate this, a series of shallow filtration trenches (filter drains) have been specified to drain any surface run off which may pond in this area. The report states that the plot size is approximately 0.72 ha. DM6 states that on sites of between 0.5 hectares and 1 hectare, SuDS schemes should include at least two forms of naturalised filtration. Rain gardens and attenuation basins are two forms of naturalised filtration, however the proposed attenuation basins are located within 20m of the SINC woodland canopy boundary, and must be relocated out of this buffer zone. The car park and access road are proposed to be drained by permeable block paving and permeable asphalt respectively, with infiltration crates below the car park. Some of the building roof drainage is also proposed to be channelled through the infiltration crates. There is an area of high flood risk within the site and a series of filter drains are proposed to eliminate ponding in this area. It is not clear from the site plan where these are proposed to be located or where this drainage is discharged from the filter drains. The CIRIA SuDS pollution mitigation index must be used to demonstrate that the proposed SuDS features provide sufficient pollution mitigation. Drainage from the buildings would be piped to the attenuation basins. The drainage from the southern side of the building appears to go through rain gardens but the

	drainage from the northern side of the building is piped directly to the attenuation basin and is not routed through any rain gardens. Exceedance flows on the eastern side of the site would enter Telegraph Woods SINC, which could affect the hydrology of the SINC. This is not acceptable.
HCC Archaeology:	The application has been supported by 'Technical Briefing Note – Archaeology and Heritage' (EDP 2022). This document assesses that the site has some potential for archaeological remains (para 6.1.2) but that any archaeological remains which might have been present are likely to have been compromised through later construction and agricultural practices (as evidenced through historic mapping and LiDAR), (para 8.3). It concludes, 'Based on the above evidence, this assessment has identified that the site has no potential for archaeological deposits to survive within the site' (para 8.2). I agree that the site has been the subject of extensive development during the 20th century. Reviewing LiDAR for the site clearly shows that, compared to the surrounding woodland, the site has been significantly altered. As such, it is reasonable to conclude that the archaeological potential of the site has been compromised. Although I would not go as far as the submitted document as saying that the site retains no archaeological potential (in my opinion, it may not be possible to completely rule out the presence of surviving archaeology), it is clear that it has been lowered to such a point that the imposition of an archaeological condition would not be proportionate to the risk of impact, under the terms of NPPF. As such, I do not wish to raise any archaeological issues.
HCC Flood:	<u>Comments 5 June 2023 (following amended plans):</u> Thank you for sending over the amended details. The LLFA would have no objection to minor relocating of the basins with the equivalent volumes and infiltration rates maintained. <u>Comments 20 April 2023 (following receipt of additional information):</u> No objection. Additional information provided is sufficient to address out comments. <u>Comments 9 February 2023:</u> Further information required. The site is within Flood Zone 1 and is generally at very low risk of flooding from surface water, other than a small, isolated area at high risk within the site. Infiltration testing has been undertaken on site, showing that infiltration is possible for the surface water drainage strategy. All groundwater level information provided in the submission is from the summer during a drought year, therefore further groundwater monitoring is required in the winter period to confirm that one metre of unsaturated ground will be retained beneath the proposed infiltration features. The surface water drainage strategy relies on permeable paving, crate soakaways and an infiltration basin.

	Calculations have been provided to show that flooding does not occur for the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100-year storm events plus, allowances for climate change. 40% has been used for both storm events however 45% should be considered for the 1 in 100-year event or suitable reasoning should be provided for the choice of value. The infiltration rate used is slightly high compared with the lowest rate recorded in testing. Consideration needs to be given to flood exceedance flow routes, runoff treatment through the proposed drainage system (simple index approach) and maintenance requirements for the proposed strategy. The following information is required: • Winter groundwater levels, • 45% climate change allowance for the 1 in 100 year storm calculations, • The lowest recorded infiltration rate to be used in the calculations, • Flood exceedance flow routes on a plan, • An assessment of runoff treatment (simple index approach), • SuDS maintenance information.
DRP:	The Panel noted the progress made to the scheme since it was last reviewed at the pre-application stage and the responses to the comments made. The most significant change being to the orientation of the central courtyard, which now faces south. This was considered to be a successful move which greatly enhanced the scheme, as was angling the western wing to further open up the courtyard space. It was also noted that comments in relation to the location of the main ancillary servicing areas had also been addressed, placing these along the northern side at ground floor level. However, one consequence of reorienting the building is an increased number of north facing bedrooms, albeit was accepted that these would have a pleasant outlook across the neighbouring reservoir and towards the woods. Notwithstanding, it was suggested that there was scope to provide easterly and westerly aspects to the end bedrooms through the use of corner windows, which would suit the contemporary nature of the design proposed. Or make more of an internal feature of these north facing windows if it compromises the internal layouts. There may also be scope to light the top floor rooms and spaces from above via rooflights. Overall, it was considered that there was a significant amount of shared space around the building, including seating areas at the end of corridors to provide interest and social interaction. These features were welcomed, as were small private patio/terraces to ground floor bedrooms and the well landscaped garden spaces. Some concern as to the quality of outlook for some of the western facing bedrooms was raised, particularly those at ground floor level with parking spaces immediately in front of windows. Whilst the layout of the car park and use of tree planting and landscaping to break up the space, so as not to result in a sea of parked cars, was welcomed, ideally parking should be kept away from bedroom windows. The nature of surfacing material for the car park also needs to be considered, so as to prevent

large areas of tarmac. In terms of general mass, form and elevational appearance, no particular issues were raised in relation to the overall scale of the building, although it was suggested that some site sections be provided to better assess the relationship with the reservoirs and trees surrounding the site. How will views from the building be impacted and how might it be viewed from the wider surrounding area.

The revisions to the elevational compositions and use of visually softer materials to provide a 'less urban' design were noted. Those now proposed will likely work better with the character of the site and neighbouring woodland, although the design is still very urban in its form and appearance but was still welcomed and supported by the Panel. However, it was noted that some of the design hierarchy and variety of the previous pre-application scheme has been lost in terms of the use of the materials and differing window sizes and positions. Whilst there was no objection to how materials and detailing are proposed to be used in this latest scheme, it has resulted in some awkward elements, such as a large blank section of brick wall to the northern end of the western elevation. The position and size of windows is also now very homogeneous, all remaining the same despite being on different elevations and having differing outlooks. This should be reviewed to bring back a sense of hierarchy to the elevations informed by an assessment of the impact of solar gain upon internal spaces. This may also identify the need for external shading which again may further change the external elevations.

Other aspects of the design which need to be considered at this stage, due to their potential impact upon the building's elevations, are the mounting of PV panels to the roof, as well as heating and cooling plant ducting, safety barriers, etc, which if visible above the parapet would adversely impact the otherwise simple clean form of the building. How the roofs will be drained and the need for internal or external hoppers and downpipes (the Panel strongly recommend researching internal drainage options due to the maintenance and visual benefits provided) will also impact the external appearance and elevational compositions and need to be shown on the planning drawings and CGI images.

The submission suggests a considerable quantity of high-quality brick detailing, which will provide interest and variety. However, the subtlety of this detailing needs to be retained throughout the detailed design stage, to ensure that building regulation requirements, etc. do not result in such features being watered down. Equally, it needs to be ensured that such features are not value engineered out of the scheme. As such, it is recommended that these detailed features, including aspects such as window reveals, parapet coping, material transition details, etc. are all secured via planning conditions. This could be in the form of 1:5 or 1:20 detailed sections through various parts of the elevation. Preferably these details should be agreed prior to any planning consent being granted.

	To conclude, the Panel were generally supportive of the scheme as presented and felt that it has the potential to be a high-quality development which will provide an attractive environment for residents. However, more detailed design information was requested so as not to adversely impact the appearance and quality of the final product.
--	--

Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

Policies: Policies: S1 (sustainable development), S2 (approach to development), S5 (New development in the countryside), S9 (Green infrastructure), S11 (Transport infrastructure), DM1 (general development), DM2 (environmentally sustainable development), DM3 (climate change), DM5 (Managing flood risk), DM6 (surface water management), DM8 (pollution), DM11 (nature conservation), DM13 (access), DM14 (parking), DM25 (Delivering older peoples housing), DM26 (Residential extensions and replacement dwellings in the countryside), DM29 (Dwellings with higher access standards), and DM38 (funding infrastructure).

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Accommodation for Older People and Those in Need of Care, Quality Places, Planning Obligations, Environmentally Sustainable Development, Biodiversity, and Trees and Development.

Site Visit	Yes ☒	No ☐
28 February 2023.		

Assessment:

Site & Surroundings

The application site is situated to the eastern side of Moorhill Road (A27) and comprises an extensive sized plot (an area of approx. 0.71 hectares (1.76 acres)), on which formerly stood a detached, two-storey dwellinghouse believed to have dated from the 19th Century. The property, which was of a simple form and design, was damaged in a fire in 2010 with the remnants of the building having been substantively demolished in 2018. The site also benefits from an extant planning approval for a single replacement dwelling (F/20/87694). The plot has gated access from Moorhill Road, with an extensive length of fencing marking the highway boundary.

In terms of the surroundings, the site is bound by two covered Southern Water reservoirs to the north and south, with Telegraph Woods to the north-east, and falls within designated countryside. It should be noted that Telegraph Woods is designated for pasture woodland and wooded commons which are considerable biological and historical interest (criteria 1D) and areas of heathland which are afforested or have succeeded to woodland (criteria 3Bi). Further, there are two Scheduled Monuments, the closer in Telegraph Woods (170m north), separated by the reservoir, and the further Hickley Wood Hillfort (265m north-east) separated by a thick woodland. Neither of which would be impacted or even visible from the site. It is also noted that the nearest Listed Building (some 700m to the north) is St John the Evangelist church, which is Grade II Listed, by local architect John Colson and was built in 1874. Given the distance away from the site, it is not visible to or from the site.

Proposal

The proposed development comprises the construction of a care home facility falling within the C2 use class which would provide 24-hour on-site care provision for its residents. The care home is designed as a three-storey building of an upside down 'U-shaped' footprint (when viewed as an aerial) with a gross external footprint of approx. 1,461m². This consists of 70no. single occupancy bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms, along with a range of communal areas and ancillary facilities set across the three floors. Staff facilities along with 'back of house' areas such as kitchen and laundry rooms are situated at ground floor level along the northern section of the building.

The proposals include the provision of a range of external terraces with landscaped amenity space to the east and south of the building, including sensory gardens with an entwining path, a gazebo and greenhouse. SuDs features have also been incorporated within the external amenity area.

The entrance to the building is set to the western elevation, fronting the parking area. The vehicle parking area would consist of 23no. parking spaces, which include 2no. disabled bays. Cycle parking is situated along the northern boundary of the site, along with refuse storage, plant compound and a sub-station.

The cycle parking comprises a clear shelter, measuring 4.1m by 2.1m, and approx. 2.2m in height, housing 12no. bicycles. The bin storage would measure approx. 4.4m by 6.2m and would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.1 and would be finished in timber cladding. The plant compound would have a footprint of 8.4m by 4.1m and would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.4m. This would be finished in 'timber style cladding'. The sub-station would have a square footprint (4m x 4m) and would have a flat roof height of approx. 2.7m, this would be finished in red brickwork with dark gold upvc fenestration.

Principle

The application site falls within designated countryside protected by Policy S5. This Policy sets out that new development in the countryside is generally restricted and notes (1) compatible usages for which new development in the countryside is appropriate. (1.b) states that *residential extensions and replacement buildings* can be appropriate, which would, in this specific instance, then engage Policy DM26. Policy S5 also goes on to note (2) that new development in the countryside will seek to avoid adverse impacts upon the intrinsic character of the landscape.

From the site history, it is noted that formerly there was a residential dwellinghouse on site, as such would engage Policy DM26. This Policy is also subdivided into different sections. Section 1 of this Policy sets out that replacement dwellings in the countryside can be acceptable, subject to criteria including; the replacement should not be disproportionate in size, neighbouring properties or involve any extension to the existing curtilage. The replacement should be within the curtilage, on the same footprint, unless justification is provided otherwise, and that no additional dwellings are created. Section 3 of this Policy states that *residential institutions will be treated for the purposes of this policy in the same way as dwellings*. The proposal is to replace a former single dwelling with a 70-bed care-home, which is considered acceptable in terms of basic principle, however it is acknowledged that the proposal would be significantly larger than the previous building on the site.

The Local Plan also includes Policy DM25, which promotes suitable accommodation for older people, including specialist accommodation, providing it meets certain criteria. This sets out (1) new development should seek to respond to the requirements of an ageing population by increasing the supply of specialist housing and accessible housing in accordance with Policy DM29, and (2) be located in sustainable locations, with good access to the public transport network, close to local facilities, and (3) be well integrated

into the local community. The Councils Policy Officer noted that *depending on the public transport provision and level of mobility of the residents, facilities such as shops and doctors in West End may be reasonably accessible (as they are within a mile). This site is outside of the urban edge, on the edge of the settlement and it is set back from Moorhill Road. While it is not in an isolated location, it is not well integrated in accordance with the policy.* In this vein, it should be noted that the applicant has provided additional information with regard to the end occupier. It is therefore understood that the end occupiers would have limited mobility and would not be able to drive/ access certain commodities independently, thus would be heavily reliant on carers. As noted, the site whilst located within the countryside is not 'isolated' in physical terms, given its siting adjacent to the settlement edge, and links to public transport. Given that the end occupier would not be able to be completely independent, the siting not being a 'prime/ well-integrated' location is considered to be outweighed when compared to the provision of elderly/ care home accommodation.

If considering the scale of the proposed development and its location in isolation, the proposals would conflict with Local Plan Policy DM26. However, it is recognised that there is a need for older peoples' accommodation in the Borough and this proposal involves the reuse of a vacant site for this use. Following the receipt of additional information consultees have not identified any adverse harm resulting from the proposals, thus would not be considered to outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Ultimately, the proposal meets the general principles for development in the countryside with regard to Policy S5. Further, the proposals broadly align with Policy DM25 by providing needed accommodation for the elderly, albeit not in complete accordance with specific regard to siting. To conclude, the Council's Planning Policy Officer raised no objection to this development. Whilst identifying some conflict with Policies, the proposals, providing needed accommodation for the elderly, are ultimately considered to be acceptable in principle, and would be subject to the considerations outlined below.

Further, Paragraph 11 of the NPPF relates to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with sub-paragraph d) ii) relating to the decision-taking process, noting that permission should be granted unless *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.* Paragraph 14 elaborates on this stating that where the application involves the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development would be assessed against the criteria laid out (a-d). In addition to this, Section 5 of the NPPF (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes) Paragraphs 60 – 67 also outline the importance of housing provision for a variety of people, including the elderly.

Sustainable Development

The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF' or 'Framework') is a significant material consideration in the assessment and determination of planning applications. Section 2 of the NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three over-arching objectives – economic, social and environmental (which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways) that should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of policies in the Framework. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so, should take local circumstance into account to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area. Each of the three dimensions of sustainability is considered in turn in the sections below.

The NPPF also states that development proposals which accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless: the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas of assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Economic Sustainability

Paragraph 8 of the NPPF sets out that the economic objective of sustainable development is to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure.

The proposals would provide economic benefits, these include employment opportunities that would be created during the construction phase of the development, which would in turn result in increased spending within the local economy, for example materials, goods and other services. Also, and once completed, the proposals would create 53 full time jobs for employees. In addition, there would be financial contributions towards; highways, public art and NHS secured via a S106 Agreement.

Social Sustainability

The main objective is to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities to be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations by ensuring that sufficient number and range of homes can be provided and that they are well designed with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being. The application seeks the erection of a care home, thus seeking to provide additional housing for the elderly, in line with Policy DM25 of the Local Plan and the NPPF which supports and encourages a range of accommodation. The proposals would therefore achieve social sustainability.

Environmentally Sustainability

The size and location of the application site is such that it has the potential to impact on a number of environmental factors, with these being discussed in detail below.

Design and Layout

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of the surrounding areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbouring, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design and siting.

Starting with the layout, it should be noted that this has been inferred by previous pre-application advice. The building is set in from all boundaries, proposing an 'upside down U shape' footprint with central courtyard to the south, and west wing being at a slightly obtuse angle. As noted within the publicity section of this report, DRP fully supported the siting, footprint and location including the siting of the main ancillary services along the north (at ground floor level). It was also noted that there is a sufficient amount of shared space both internally and externally, including some private patio/ terraces and well landscaped shared garden spaces. The submitted landscape plan shows the general arrangement (including boundary treatment comprising 1.2m railings and 1.8m palisade

fencing around the site boundary). Whilst in principle this is acceptable, further details and planting are recommended to be secured via condition.

In terms of general mass, form, scale and elevational appearance, the proposals are considered to be appropriate given the immediate and wider surrounding context of the site. The proposals would create a three-storey building of varying masses and heights, set back within the site with a vegetated boundary and parking to the immediate east of Moorhill Road, thus reducing the buildings dominance from the streetscene. This is also aided by the elevational compositions which use visually softer materials thus providing a 'less urban' design. This is considered to work harmoniously with the character of the site and neighbouring woodland. Although it is acknowledged that the design is still very urban in its form and appearance it was still welcomed and supported by DRP.

DRP also sought to better understand the design, in terms of functionality. This included rainwater goods, as well as PV panels and heating and cooling plants situated on the roof, which would also need to be surrounded by safety barriers. Additional plans were provided following DRP which sought to show these features in more detail. It is acknowledged that some roof equipment would be slightly visible as shown on the submitted elevations, however in practice, it is unlikely they would be visible from public vantage points as a result of height/ distances and the parapet, which does largely conceal these roof features. Down pipes have also been depicted on the submitted plans. Whilst these are visible, they are not considered to detract from the clean and well-designed elevations.

Further, as noted above DRP were supportive of the overall design and finish. They advised the importance of the finish, as such plans were provided to show the material palette and how materials would connect as well as window details. The proposals would be finished in a combination of dark red and light red brick work, timber cladding and dark gold upvc fenestration, of which would sit flush within the elevations. The materials are considered to be of a high-quality, as such it would be recommended that these be secured via condition, including further details, to ensure the overall finish would be delivered to a high-quality.

To conclude, the DRP were supportive of the scheme as a whole and noted that it has potential to be a high-quality development which will provide an attractive environment for residents. Following the receipt of additional information, it is recommended that details be secured via condition to ensure the proposals are of a high-quality finish and landscaping enhances the site and surroundings. Ultimately, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with Policy DM1 and would therefore be acceptable in this regard.

Internal & External Space for Future Occupiers

In terms of space, the Council's Quality Places SPD sets out standards for internal and external space for future occupiers, however, these standards specifically relate to residential dwellinghouses (Class C3). Whereas this application proposes the addition of a care home (Class C2), therefore these standards would not directly apply.

The Council does, however, have an SPD relating to 'Accommodation for Older People and Those in Need of Care'. Within this SPD it sets out that the Care Quality Commission (CQC), which was formed in 2009, regulates care provided by the health authorities, local authorities, private companies and voluntary organisations, including residential care homes for adults/ nursing homes. The CQC has published essential standards of quality and safety which care providers must comply with. The proposals would therefore be obligated to meet the necessary standards under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2009 and Care Quality Commission (Registration) Regulations 2009. Further, care providers are required to register with the CQC. The care provider would therefore need to ensure the development would comply with these legislations and requirements, which would fall outside the remit of planning. However,

and from the LPAs perspective it should be noted that the rooms are of an acceptable size, served with en-suites and are afforded with sufficient natural light and ventilation measures. External space is also provided to serve the future occupiers, and visitors. This would also be subject to a landscaping condition.

Further to the space and living conditions, noise has been raised by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. A noise assessment report was submitted and referred to residential or dwelling noise limits. The minimum standard could be met; however, concern was raised with regard to the impact of noise upon the specific type of end user. Given that the minimum standard can be met, the proposals would be considered acceptable. They also noted that a road traffic noise survey was carried out, this concluded that the noise limits would be acceptable and ultimately would comply with the upper limit advised for dwellings. Therefore, and to conclude the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Impact upon Neighbouring Amenities

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) amongst other matters, stipulates that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

This section will be broken down into different parts, comprising; built structure, construction phase, and lifetime/ operation of the development. It should also be noted that the Council's Environmental Health Officer has been consulted as part of this application, whereby their comments will be incorporated below.

With regard to the built structure, the closest properties are those opposite the application site, with these dwellings forming part of a ribbon development to the western side of Moorhill Road. Given their siting and separation distance in relation to the application site, the proposed care home building itself is not considered to have any adverse impacts, in terms of being overbearing, upon the amenities of these neighbouring properties.

Turning to the construction phase. Given the scale and nature of the proposals, it is considered necessary that controls be in place to prevent/ mitigate any adverse harm arising at this stage. Some consultees have requested a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). As such, it is considered that within this plan, measures to protect the amenities of the neighbouring properties would be included. Further, construction hours are recommended to be conditioned so as to lessen any potential impact during this phase.

In terms of the operational stage of the development there would be plant equipment, ventilation measures for future occupiers, a kitchen and electrical substation. The Council's Environmental Health Officer noted that plan referenced (drawing 3127-HIA-01-ZZ-DR-A-2701 "Proposed Roof Plan") shows a ventilation plant on the roof. It was acknowledged that there are some neighbouring dwellings, however they are some distance away. Given the separation distance it was considered that a limit of 5 decibels below the background sound level could be achievable despite not being furnished with details of the exact controls. In addition to this, it was noted that the controls and limitations are likely to be achieved given that the ventilation systems would have more of an impact upon the occupiers of the development itself, than the neighbouring amenities. The kitchen must also be designed to control odours, fumes and noise impacting the development itself and neighbouring amenities. Lastly, and turning to the proposed electrical substation, which is proposed to be situated along the northern boundary, shared with the reservoir. This is shown to be enclosed by masonry walling which should help to reduced exposure to electromagnet radiation.

Ultimately, and to conclude, subject to relevant conditions, the proposals are not considered to result in an adversely harmful impact upon the amenities of the neighbouring properties, thus would be acceptable in this regard.

Highway Safety, Parking & Refuse Storage

Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires that development is or could be well served by public transport, cycling and walking and it includes measures which minimise its impact on the existing highway network. Policy DM14 of the same Plan requires that an appropriate level of car parking be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards. The policy provisions are consistent with the requirements of the NPPF and in particular those of paragraphs 107 and 108.

Due to the nature of the proposals, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been consulted. Initially concerns were raised with regard to pedestrian access. However, following additional information (plan referenced 3127-HIA-XX-22-DR-A-0101) the concerns previously raised were removed and no objection raised.

No concern was raised with regard to access, subject to conditions. No concern was raised with regard to internal site layout, although it was advised that specific standards be adhered to, should the roads be up for adoption. In this instance, the roads are not up for adoption, as such, should this change later on, this would be separate to the planning application process. The information provided with regard to servicing was also considered to be acceptable.

With regard to trip generation, the application was supported by a Transport Statement, which noted that an additional 112 vehicle trips on the local highway network would be anticipated as a result of the development. This was broken down into peak hour impacts (morning (AM) and evening (PM)). The LHA noted that, cumulatively with other development proposals there would be impacts on the local highway network, and infrastructure that requires upgrading, however in terms of PM impacts, this would be negligible, particularly when considered against existing flow rates.

In terms of parking provisions, the Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD sets out that there should be 1 space per 6 bedrooms plus 1 space per staff member, thus equating to 34no. parking spaces (assuming 22 staff maximum at any one time). The application proposes 23no. car parking spaces (this includes: 2 disabled spaces. There are also 12 cycle spaces, and 1 delivery bay). The car parking spaces provided are of a good size with sufficient landscaping. It is, however, acknowledged that the provision of 23no. car parking spaces would result in the shortfall of 11no. spaces when compared to the SPD. The application has, however, been supported by a Transport Assessment which notes that *based on operational experience and other consented schemes, a reduction against the standards is deemed appropriate. Additionally, staff and visitors would be encouraged to travel sustainably (car share/ public transport etc).* Whilst acknowledging there would be a shortfall of parking provisions, these figures have been calculated on a worst-case scenario of employees, whereby it is further noted that there are bus stops within 0.5 miles of the site so sustainable transport measures are available. Thus, the shortfall of parking provisions alone, is not considered to warrant reason for refusal.

To conclude, the proposals are considered to be acceptable with regard to highways matters. Developer Contributions and TRO monies would be secured via S106, and conditions would also be recommended to ensure the proposals do not result in any adverse harm.

Ecology & Trees

Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.

Due to the nature of development, the Council's Arboriculturalist and Ecologist have been consulted.

The Council's Arboriculturalist raised concern with regard to sightlines for the entrance, relocation of the entrance resulting in the loss of a tree (T39), dominance of the trees to the south and potential shading. They also noted that the use of cellular confinement would need to be demonstrated for the car park area, as some parking spaces fall within some RPAs. Additional information would also be required with regard to T41 where the area around this tree would be hand dug, the Arboricultural Officer also required a contingency plan to be provided if significant roots are found. In terms of the entrance, the LHA have reviewed this and have raised no objection to the sightlines or access arrangements. Therefore, whilst the loss of the tree (T39) is regrettable, this ensures that the access is acceptable from a highways perspective. The other matters raised (including cellular confinement) can be suitably covered by an updated Arboricultural Method Statement which is recommended to be conditioned. As such, subject to this, the proposals are considered acceptable in this regard.

Originally, the Council's Ecologist raised an objection with regard to the proposals on the basis of lack of buffer to Telegraph Woods (SINC) and additional information was requested in relation to drainage and its flow routes. Following additional information, the concerns were limited to the location of SuDs features within the SINC buffer.

Amended plans and additional information were submitted (18 May 2023), whereby the applicant relocated the SuDs features to ensure that they were not within the SINC buffer. The Council's Ecologist reviewed these amended plans and removed their objection, noting that the SuDs features were acceptable. The Ecologist did note that CEMP and BEMP could be conditioned, and also requested that the 'lighting assessment' be updated. It is, however, considered that all of these matters can be secured via conditioned with additional information to be provided and discharged at a later date. The fundamental siting of SuDs features have been agreed with the Council's Ecologist and therefore, subject to conditions, the proposals are considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Flooding & Drainage

Policies DM3 and DM6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulate that new development must provide sustainable drainage systems (SuDs) wherever feasible, naturalised filtration should also be included. Policy DM5 of same Plan states that development will only be permitted within the areas at risk of flooding providing that certain criteria are met, comprising; sequential tests (where required), site specific flood risk assessment, incorporation of flood protection, resilience and resistance measures, and site drainage systems which are designed taking account of events which exceed normal standards.

The application site falls within Flood Zone 1 and is generally at very low risk of flooding from surface water, other than a small, isolated area at high risk within the site. Table 2 (Flood risk vulnerability and floor zone 'incompatibility') of the National Planning Practice Guidance sets out that all development is acceptable, in principle, within Flood Zone 1. The proposals are therefore considered acceptable in this regard.

Turning to drainage, originally, the Council's Ecologist raised an objection, the LLFA requested additional information, and Natural England made comments highlighting the requirements and need for SuDS conditions. Following these comments, the requested additional information was provided.

The additional information provided comprised; Drainage Strategy, Revised Micro Drainage Basin Calculations, Catchment Plan and SuDS Management and Maintenance Strategy. The LLFA reviewed this information and relocated SuDS features and ultimately raised no objection. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard, subject to condition.

Contaminated Land

Policy DM8 of the submitted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that development will not be permitted if it is likely to cause loss of amenity or impact upon public health or other unacceptable environmental impacts; including land contamination.

Owing to the nature and location of the proposals, the Council's Contaminated Land Team (CLT) have been consulted upon.

The application was supported by a contaminated land report which reviewed the historical uses on and adjacent to the site. The assessment of land contamination risks to future occupiers of the site has been carried out on the basis that no consumption of home grown produce (fruit and vegetables) will occur. This is also recommended to be secured via condition.

Whilst little development other than residential is reported to have occurred on site, the report notes adjacent land uses which have the potential to impact this site. Namely the development of reservoirs nearby and former gravel pits and electricity sub stations. On site demolition has occurred with evidence of uncontrolled uses, including fly tipping and burning of waste. An above ground oil tank is present on site, however its purpose is not explained. The report's author identifies potential risks from soil contamination and from ground gases.

Testing of soils for chemical contaminants does not show exceedances of the generic screening criteria for residential use without consumption of home grown produce. The assessment of ground gases reported indicates that no particular gas protection measures are required. Elevated levels of carbon dioxide measured are not considered adversely harmful. Whilst the site likely has a low ground gas risk, there is concern that the sampling of ground gas on site would not have been able to detect gas in the made ground as the response zone of the boreholes does not appear to encounter this strata.

Notwithstanding the above concerns CLT do not object to the proposed development, subject to conditions being imposed restricting, as described above, consumption of produce grown on site and management of the accommodation, and site investigation report shortcomings. CLT also consider that a discovery strategy for unexpected contamination encountered during development would also be prudent. Further, where imported soils are to be utilised on site these should also meet with the approval of the LPA prior to their use on site. As such, and subject to conditions this is considered to be acceptable.

Sustainability

Policy DM2 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires new development to be environmentally sustainable. In this instance, the proposals would result in development above 500sq.m floorspace (measured externally), therefore must achieve BREEAM 'excellent' (or equivalent). This Policy is also supported by the Council's Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD.

The application has been supported by a Sustainability Statement, which seeks to demonstrate how sustainability will be integrated into the development. This proposes a pre-assessment target score of 77.49% and an 'excellent' rating. It has therefore been, principally, demonstrated that the proposals could be Policy compliant and achieve BREEAM excellent rating. To ensure these targets are met a condition is recommended to be imposed securing formal certification to be submitted to the LPA within 12 months of occupation.

SPA Mitigations

The Council, as the responsible body for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), must ensure as part of a planning application that a development will not have an adverse impact upon any European protected sites, and specifically in this case, the European protected Solent Complex (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites), River Itchen (SAC) and New Forest National Park (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites). It is recognised that the proposals could have an adverse impact upon the surrounding designated European protected sites, if not mitigated.

Due to the nature of the proposals, a HRA was undertaken and submitted to Natural England for their review. They concluded that the LPA would need to be satisfied with the justification provided by the applicant with regard to the impact upon the Solent SPA and New Forest. They also advised that the LPA would need to be satisfied with the 0.9 occupancy rate in terms of nitrate calculations. They further noted and suggested conditions be imposed in relation to SuDs and CEMP. The LPA had conversations and sought additional information from the applicant to arrive at the conclusions proposed within the HRA to Natural England, therefore the LPA are satisfied. The LPA, as the competent body under the Habitats and Species Regulations (2019) are therefore satisfied that the mitigation proposed is sufficient to address the impacts arising from the development upon European Protected Sites.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 28(1) (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), as the application is being granted contrary to the advice of Natural England, a 21-day notice period is required. This timeframe has since lapsed, and there are pre-commencement conditions which will require discharging prior to the commencement of any works. However, a condition is still recommended to be imposed.

The Solent & Southampton Water Special Protection Area is an internationally designated conservation site and is protected for its overwintering birds. It is recognised that new house building (within a 5.6km buffer of the designated area) is placing increased pressure on these overwintering birds from more people visiting the coastline. As such the Council requires all housing developments within the buffer to make a financial contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy, which aims to limit recreational disturbance to our coastline through careful management. The application site falls within the 5.6m buffer and therefore would be required to contribute towards the Solent Mitigation Project. However, and given the nature of the development, the LPA requested additional information on the specifics of the end occupier/user. The applicant provided information which was able to evidence that the end user would not result in an adverse impact upon the Solent, by way of recreational disturbance, given that they could not independently access the protected area, nor would they be owning any pets, which contribute towards an adverse impact upon the area. It was therefore not considered reasonable to require mitigations to offset harm, which is not considered to arise as a result of the proposals. Natural England has reviewed the Appropriate Assessment and has concluded that it is for the Council as competent authority to be satisfied with the justification.

In terms of water quality, Natural England have advised that new housing development should achieve nutrient neutrality in order to mitigate the impacts of additional nitrogen

arising from the sewage generated by the future residents. This wastewater then feeds into the Solent Complex via Waste-Water Treatment Works which discharges into the river network and so causes eutrophication affecting the features for which it is designated. The Council has adopted its own strategy for achieving nutrient neutrality whereby it identifies areas of agricultural land and remove these from a nitrate intensive use, thus reducing the nitrogen input into the protected sites, with the level of reduction then being used as a means of offsetting the impacts of development proposals within the Borough. This ensures no overall net increase in nitrates within the Solent and thereby allow a development to achieve nutrient neutrality. In order to do this, the Council calculates the level of nitrate mitigation this land provides (measured in kg) and makes 'nitrate credits' available to developers to buy, with funding being secured during the planning application. The Agent submitted a nitrogen budget which concluded that the proposals would result in an additional 83.39kgTN/year. They calculated this on the basis of a 0.9 occupancy rate. The proposals are for a 70-bed care home, where it is understood that there would be 1 occupier per room. Given the nature of the proposals and end occupier, a reduced rate of 0.9 was considered reasonable. The applicant has provided evidence that this stance has been used and supported by Natural England elsewhere along the South Coast. In this specific instance, Natural England advised that the Council is the competent authority and need to be satisfied with the lesser occupancy rate. The LPA are ultimately agreeable to the figures and measures, providing mitigations are secured (via condition).

Furthermore, Natural England has also recently raised concern with regard to additional residential development within 13.8km radius of the New Forest. This is considered to have an adverse impact upon the New Forest by way of additional trips resulting in further recreational disturbance. The New Forest is affected by way of recreational disturbance, the same as the Solent. Therefore, the same assessment outlined above applies, whereby given the nature of the proposals and the distance from the application site to the New Forest, it is unlikely that the proposals would result in an adverse impact upon the New Forest.

Other Matters

The application would also be subject to a S106 Agreement, which will secure the following matters:

- Sustainable Transport
- Traffic Regulation Orders
- Public Art Contributions
- NHS Contributions

In accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Pre-commencement Conditions) Regulations 2018, the Local Planning Authority informed the agent of the pre-commencement conditions to which they confirmed they were agreeable (email dated 18 July 2023).

Equalities Act:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2021 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 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 this, 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 Local Plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the 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 Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. The NPPF and Policies, S1, DM2, and DM3 of the 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 limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

Conclusion:

The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐