

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT:**Application Ref:** F/23/95181**Site Address:** Hillview Manor Park, Winchester Road, SO50 7HD**Case Officer:** Clare Martin**Description:** Change of use of land for 10no. residential lodges

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Outside of the urban edge (within countryside) • Not within Solent Mitigation and Disturbance Zone • Not within New Forest Mitigation and Disturbance Zone • Within Southern Water Sewer Buffer • Within Archaeology Buffer		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
<u>Other applications submitted</u> • F/23/95179 – Erection of 1no. five-bedroom dwelling following removal of the mobile home – Refused (10/7/23) • F/23/95181 - Change of use of land for the stationing of 14no. caravan compliant lodges to be used as holiday accommodation and associated infrastructure – Currently being determined.		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>6 letters of objection and 1 comment letter</u> <i>Access and Highways</i> • Access is overgrown, with a blind dip on busy road. • Difficult crossing road suggested putting in pedestrian crossing. • Insufficient car parking • The two lodges on existing site will remove half of the parking for the site. Homes 29-34 have no other parking. <i>Residential Amenity</i> • Loss of privacy and additional noise affecting existing residents • Dust pollution <i>Other</i> • Loss of wildlife • Current site is poorly not maintained. • Impact on existing water pipe. • Existing site has some vacant mobile homes <u>Local Planning Authority Response</u> • Comments are noted and access and highways, car parking, residential amenity, ecology, the impact on existing infrastructure and the need for the development are covered within the assessment section. • Maintenance issues and are not material planning considerations and so cannot be assessed as part of the application.		

	Had the application been approved it would have been possible to limit the effects of dust and debris from construction works through a pre-commencement construction environmental management plan condition.
Planning Policy:	<u>Objection</u> Hillview Manor Park is an existing residential lodge site north of Fair Oak. It is outside the urban edge and identified as countryside on the Policies Map. Policy S5 in the adopted Local Plan therefore applies to any proposed development on or adjacent to this site. In addition the northern part of the application site, where 8 residential lodges are proposed to be sited, is in an area safeguarded for minerals and waste in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste plan (where development should not sterilise these resources). The existing lodge site is not within the safeguarded area. Policy S5(1) sets out the uses appropriate in the countryside and S5(2) provides criteria for new development in these uses. Appropriate residential uses in policy S5(1) include residential extensions and replacement buildings, limited residential conversions, rural workers' dwellings and accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. New dwellings are not included in the list and therefore the proposal is contrary to policy S5 in the adopted Local Plan.
Ecology Officer:	- This site is located approximately 125 m from the Hill Copse ancient woodland edge. - There are records of common toads, bats, notable species of higher plants and hedgehogs in the immediate area. An Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA), lighting plan, surface water drainage plan and biodiversity enhancement would be required in line with local and national policy. I am not convinced that there is enough room to provide biodiversity enhancement on these two very constrained sites, however the ecologist writing the EclA report may be able to provide biodiversity enhancement recommendations.
Tree Officer:	<u>Holding Objection</u> There is a significant line of cypress trees adjacent to the highway. The submitted arboricultural documents only represent one part of what we require to assess the application: the tree survey details what is on site, but nothing more. The proposal appears to show these trees removed, which we would have concerns about, including replacement planting capacity. At this stage, we raise a holding objection based on lack of information and apparent significant loss of trees. The lack of information is contrary to the Trees and Development SPD. We will require an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan, as per the SPD and British Standard 5837:2012, with consideration given to existing trees, as per the SPD.
Environmental Health	<u>Amenity</u> As a residential use, we need to be satisfied there will not be an adverse noise impact to occupiers. Elevated road traffic noise can for

	example interfere with enjoyable of a dwelling and even lead to health impacts over time. We would prefer in this case for the applicant to demonstrate the limits given by BS8233 "<i>Guidance on sound insulation and sound reduction for dwellings</i>". Without this we cannot support the application. <u>Contaminated land</u> The former use of the land as a brickworks has the potential to have caused contamination of the ground, however no information is included in the application showing how land contamination risks have been appropriately considered. Due to this and the sensitive end use proposed we recommend that the application be permitted with conditions requiring the investigation and assessment of land contamination, and a requirement that appropriate mitigation of any discovered risks be carried out to the satisfaction of the LPA. <u>Construction</u> a Construction and Environmental Management Plan would be required via condition for the associated infrastructure and dwellings works
Housing Enabling Officer:	<u>Objection</u> <u>Car Parking</u> I would object to the two units proposed to be located on the site of the existing sites current car park. It is a condition attached to the current site licence that there must be provision made for parking for units and for visitor parking. This carpark both provides the compliance for the visitor parking and the parking options for the 7 units on the lower part of the site who only have footpath access to their mobile homes (which is access from this car park) and do not have any other car access or individual parking bays beside their mobile homes (nor would this be possible to accommodate due to the existing location/spacing of these 7 units. <u>Other</u> The consultation response goes onto outlines amendments and requirements for the licencing process.
Transport Officer (HCC):	<u>No objection to principle</u> but require site access plan and vehicle tracking details. <u>Access</u> The proposal will use two access points, with two residential lodges accessed from the existing southern access and two residential lodges from the northern access, which will be improved under the proposals. In terms of the southern access, this is acceptable with adequate space for manoeuvres and acceptable visibility splays. The access already serves the existing residential lodges on site. The northern access for the remaining eight residential lodges is provided from the highway to the northern end of the site off Winchester Road. Whilst the access is existing, and generally accepted, given the increase in vehicle movements that would result from the proposals, this would need to be upgraded, resurfaced, and conform to current visibility standards set by recorded speeds.

	Additionally, a width suitable for the passing of two vehicles (one accessing / one egressing) would need to be provided, and this should be inclusive of an allowance for a refuse vehicle. A vehicle tracking exercise should be undertaken to demonstrate these movements. <u>Internal layout</u> Whilst the internal site would not be adoptable, demonstration that the site is capable of supporting movement for refuse and emergency vehicles should be provided, inclusive of where bin collection points would be located. A vehicle tracking exercise would again be requested to accompany this.
Minerals and Waste Team (HCC):	<u>No objection</u> Due to the site not reaching the 3 hectare threshold, we do not consider the site to be a viable mineral extraction opportunity.
Flood and Water Team (HCC):	Some flood risk information has been provided, which is acceptable, however there is no surface water drainage information to review. We would need to see the proposed drainage before advising on the suitability of the proposals.
Archaeology Officer (HCC):	<u>No objection</u> The site lies within a wider landscape of some archaeological potential, with evidence for Iron Age/Romano-British occupation and Bronze Age funerary activity present within 1km of the site. LiDAR shows that the remains of an earthwork enclosure are located within Upperbarn Copse (300m to the south-west of the site), likely of an Iron Age date, and a Romano-British enclosure seen in cropmarks on the other side of the copse. Excavations undertaken ahead of development close to Crowdhill Copse (600m to the south of the site), revealed multiple Bronze Age cremation burials, which fit into a wider landscape of Bronze Age funerary activity which includes multiple burial mounds. Given this archaeological background, the site can be seen to have a potential for buried archaeological remains. The majority of the proposed development site was once occupied by a brickworks and can be seen to have been previously impacted. This impact is likely to have negatively impacted any archaeological remains which might have been present. Although the north-west corner of the site appears to have fallen outside of the area of previous impact, it represents a relatively small proportion of the overall development site. Therefore, given the widespread previous impacts, I do not believe that the burden of an archaeological condition is justified in this instance. Accordingly, I do not wish to raise any archaeological issues.
Natural England:	A habitat regulations assessment would be required for the development. The consultation response provides advice as to the issues that need to be covered within the habitat regulations assessment, including deterioration of the water environment, South Downs National Park protected landscape, ancient woodland, priority habitats and species.
Parish Council:	<u>Objection</u> That the development gives rise to highway safety concerns, as it would create additional traffic on a busy and dangerous main road with restrictive sight access and egress onto Winchester Road

	where there is a hidden dip in the road and is the site of a fatal accident 3 years ago; • That the development is contrary to current planning policy as it was beyond the urban edge; • That should the Borough be minded to grant, conditions should be placed restricting the applicant from changing the usage classification in the future to allow for permanent residential dwellings; • That the development would disturb habitats of ecological importance and impact veteran trees; • That the proposed dwellings are out of character with the street scene of the area; • That the development could have a detrimental impact on the medieval heritage site which was in close proximity to the site; and • The concerns expressed by the environmental health regarding soil contamination be supported. • The concerns expressed by the Hampshire County Council Enforcement Officer regarding the lack of planned parking for both residents and visitors to the site be supported.
Winchester City Council:	<u>No response</u>
Southern Water:	<u>Objection</u> From our initial assessment of the existing apparatus it appears that there is limited opportunity to divert existing water apparatus and building over the public water main cannot be permitted. The consultation response goes onto to provide more general advice.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out 28/6/23		

Pre-commencement Conditions:	Yes ☐	No ☒
Details:		

Legislation:
Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:- <i>"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."</i>

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 (sustainable development), S2 (approach to new development), S3 (location of new housing), S5 (new development in the countryside) & S11 (transport infrastructure); and Development Management policies DM1 (general development), DM3 (climate change), DM6 (sustainable drainage), DM8 (pollution), DM10 (water and waste water) DM11 (nature conservation), DM12 (heritage assets), DM13 (transport), DM14 (parking), DM30 (internal space standards) & DM38 (funding infrastructure).

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places, Residential Parking Standards & Trees and Development

Proposal:

Hillview Manor Park is an existing residential lodge site north of Fair Oak, which provides permanent retirement accommodation. The proposal involves the expansion of the park into the field to the north to accommodate 8no. lodges and the conversion of the existing car park to provide another two lodges. All the lodges are to provide permanent residential accommodation. The lodges are single storey two bedroomed properties and have a floor area of 60m², each with access to an external decked area and car parking.

Two further applications have been submitted involving new holiday lodges to the west of the application site (application F/23/95180) and a two-storey residential dwelling to replace an existing mobile home located to the south (F/23/95179). The proposed dwelling has subsequently been refused due to its impact on the countryside and lack of ecology information.

Assessment:**Principle**

Hillview Manor Park is an existing residential lodge site north of Fair Oak. The site is located outside of the urban edge, in an area of countryside. Policy S5(1) sets out the uses appropriate in the countryside and S5(2) provides criteria for new development in these uses. Appropriate uses in the countryside do not include new residential dwellings unless for replacement or conversion of existing buildings, rural workers dwellings or accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling show people. As such the proposal for 10 residential lodges is contrary to policy.

Furthermore, there is no overriding need for speculative housing units to be provided outside of the identified urban edge as the council has an up-to-date local plan (for the period 2016-2036) and can demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

Impact on the Countryside

Policy S5(2) provides further detailed criteria for development in the countryside including avoiding adverse impact on the rural character of the landscape and the settings of adjoining National Parks.

The existing residential lodge site is self-contained within defined boundaries and is mostly surrounded by countryside, fields and woodlands. The proposal would extend the built form past the existing site boundary into an overgrown area to the north. While the area is enclosed by tall evergreen trees along Winchester Road, there is lower-level vegetation along the western boundary and so the group of eight lodges and supporting infrastructure would be visible from the neighbouring fields. It is considered that the nature and extent of the built form, along with the associated increase in activity and car movements, would have an urbanising impact on the area of countryside. The site is located at the approach to the South Downs National Park and therefore the proposal would also have a negative impact upon the setting of the National Park.

The other part of the development involves siting two lodges within the car parking area for the existing residential lodge site. While the two lodges are within the existing site boundary, they nevertheless represent an intensification of the use by enclosing the current relatively open car park with additional single storey lodges. The car park is at the front of the site and so the additional lodges would be clearly visible from Winchester Road, where they would add to the urbanisation of the site and surrounding countryside.

Living Accommodation and Residential Amenity

The lodges are fractionally under the nationally described space standards of 61m², but the internal space is considered acceptable as they also have access to a 2.5m wide timber decking at the front. Most of the lodges are arranged in two rows of four units with their living room windows and decking facing one another across the access road.

Usually housing developments would have their main living areas and gardens to the rear where they offer more privacy. In this case, the lodges have their main living areas and outdoor decking to the front where there is only around 9m between the units. However, this type of layout is typical of caravan parks where there is inevitably higher levels of overlooking than more traditional housing and is a similar set up to the existing site.

The other two units are within the car park and will side onto the living areas of the units to the north and face the side window of the unit to the west. While there is less overlooking between these units than in the new section, lodge 23 will have some impact on the outlook from the main windows in the adjoining lodge to the north, at least until any landscaping has established.

Overall, the layout and space provided for the proposed lodges are not dissimilar to those on the existing residential site and are common for these types of non standard residential development. As such the proposed layout is considered acceptable (in terms of privacy, outlook and daylight).

However, one point of concern is the proximity of Winchester Road to the new residential units. No information has been provided as to the sound proofing for the lodges, which have the potential to be impacted by vehicles using the heavily trafficked main road. This information is required upfront to ensure that the new dwellings can be reasonably protected from noise and an objection raised by the Environmental Health Officer on this basis.

Car Parking and Access

Two of the lodges would be located within the main site and utilise the existing southern access of Winchester Road, which is acceptable. The remaining eight lodges would use the existing field access to the north which would need to be upgraded, resurfaced and redesigned to confirm to visibility standards and accommodate the additional traffic generated by the development.

No scalable site entrance plan has been provided to show how the access will be upgraded to accommodate the extra traffic movements or how visibility at the junction will be achieved. It is possible that the visibility splays will need to be widened to meet highway standards, and any increase in hard standing and loss of vegetation could have a further urbanising impact upon the character of the site when viewed from Winchester Road.

In addition, vehicular tracking details are also required to demonstrate whether refuse and emergency vehicles could access the site and two vehicles could pass each other

In terms of car parking, two on site spaces are needed for each lodge plus an extra 20% unallocated overflow parking for visitors that equates to an additional 4 spaces (as set out within the Council's residential parking standards SPD). While it appears that the lodges

have two parking spaces each, there is no indication of where the additional overflow car parking will be accommodated. Furthermore, two of the lodges would be positioned within the main visitor car park for the existing residential site and so would displace 16 existing car parking spaces. No car parking information has been submitted and there does not appear to be much left over space on the existing site to accommodate the replacement 16 car parking spaces. Without sufficient car parking within the site, the proposal has the potential to result off site parking along Winchester Road and so cause a hazard to the smooth flow of traffic along the main road.

Ecology

This site is located approximately 125 m from the Hill Copse ancient woodland edge. There are records of common toads, bats, notable species of higher plants and hedgehogs in the immediate area. In terms of protected species, there are records of common toads, bats, notable species of higher plants and hedgehogs in the immediate area and a proposal of this nature has the potential to impact upon protected species and their habits. No information has been submitted in this regard (i.e. an ecological impact assessment, external lighting plan) and as such forms an additional reason for refusal.

In terms of management, the design and access statement outlines the applicant's intention to maintain the grassed area, hedges and trees within the site's boundaries and enhance with additional planting. However, no detailed enhancement, management or maintenance plans have been provided as part of the planning application and it is not clear how this can be achieved. Furthermore, the submission fails to set out how the development will achieve a biodiversity net gain, which is also a requirement of Policy DM11.

Trees

There is a significant line of cypress trees adjacent to the highway. While a tree survey has been provided, the submission fails to properly assess the impact of the proposal on these trees (through an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan). As such an objection has been raised by the Tree Officer.

Sustainable Drainage System

New development on a site of up to 0.5 are required to have a sustainable drainage system with at least one form of naturalised filtration (as set out in Policy DM6). No sustainable drainage details have been provided for the proposal and it is unclear whether the ground conditions are suitable for infiltration, without which another drainage solution would be required and could impact on the amount of space available for the lodges.

Other

- Had the application been recommended for permission conditions would have been used to secure the contaminated land information.
- Southern Water are objecting to the development due to the affect a public water main that crosses the site. and the full details are available on the council's website.

Impact of SPA:

Recreational Disturbance

The site is not within the recreational disturbance buffer zone for the New Forest or Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area.

Nutrients

The site is within the impact zone for nitrogen and phosphorus, where new residential development has been shown to have a determinantal impact on the water quality of the River, through eutrophication. A nutrient budget has not been submitted for the development (which would likely show a positive output for nitrogen and phosphorus) and no mitigation has been provided for the increase in nutrients caused by the housing development. As such the proposal is likely to have a detrimental impact on the Special Protection Area, in terms of an increase in nutrients.

The Council has been unable to complete an appropriate assessment for the development, due to the lack of information provided by the Applicant.

Equalities Act:

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

Section 149 (1) states:

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

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

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

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

Climate Change:

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

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF and Local 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 Adopted Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. The NPPF, Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Adopted Local Plan and energy and water elements of the adopted Environmentally Sustainable Development SPD require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

It is acknowledged that the proposed lodge style homes would incorporate modern methods of insulation and they would be expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate. The new lodges will utilise the most up to date energy saving methods and will prioritise energy efficiency. Had the application been recommended for permission, then

conditions would have been imposed to ensure appropriate measures were incorporated into the development, inline with DM3.

Conclusion:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒

Comments ...