

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/23/95982

Site Address: WILLOW MEAD, WILDERN LANE, HEDGE END

Case Officer: Gary Osmond

Description: Construction of 4No. one bedroom retirement flats and associated parking.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Within the urban edge - Tree Preservation Orders (Oak – 93-E & Oak – 869-E) - Adjacent to public footpath		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Z/28701/001/00 - Erection of 36 flats for the elderly (approval of details of landscaping, materials and minor alterations to design) – Approved Sept 1987		
Z/28701/000/00 - Outline: Erection of 35 category 1 sheltered flats with warden accommodation and communal lounge – Approved June 1987		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	A total of nine objections have been received, one containing eleven signatures. The issues and concerns raised were as follows: - Loss of green space - Impact upon wildlife - Impact on trees - Impact upon the visual amenity and character of the locality - Visually intrusive - Site is waterlogged - Loss of privacy - Loss of light - Loss of outlook - Height of proposal - Redline includes land in neighbouring ownership - Detrimental impact upon existing boundary hedge through proximity and loss of light - Drainage concerns - Flooding of adjacent public footpath - Increased noise pollution - Increased traffic - Insufficient parking for wider Willow Mead flats - Access for construction vehicles - Disturbance during construction - Safety of residents during construction - Contractor parking		
Hedge End Town Council:	Objection. Overdevelopment of the site and impact upon the environment. Would add to existing flooding issues. Concerns for impact upon mature Oak.		
Trees:	Objection. The principal arboricultural features are 3no. oak trees located on neighbouring land to the south of the application site. In particular, trees 2 and 3 are considered of significance for this proposal and are subject to Tree Preservation Orders.		

	We have two main concerns with the proposal: 1) The structure encroaches into the root protection area by a relatively small amount (3.3% is stated in the arboricultural report), but we are not convinced this is a true reflection of the potential encroachment because there are modifying factors to the south, namely the existing dwelling and footpath. These built structures may have restricted the root growth in this direction, resulting in a potentially greater requirement for the proposed development area for rooting. As it stands, the application has not suitably demonstrated that this is not the case and, thus, we default to the potential for greater impact. 2) Both trees 2 and 3 will be dominant over both the proposed structure and the private amenity space, resulting in shading and perceived risk. The proposed crown lifting and reduction of the branches of T2 would provide a more acceptable relationship to the structure, but the trees would still be dominant and there is potential for post-development pressure to prune to a greater extent. Further, by pruning the tree it is accepted that there is a poor relationship at present. In other words, the existing, protected tree would be impacted by the proposal as it currently stands. The Trees and Development SPD states that layouts must be designed to ensure that retained trees are able to grow and mature in the space provided (i.e. without the requirement for pruning). We are reluctant to support any proposal where regular pruning is required to manage the relationship. As it stands, we raise an objection to the proposal as it is contrary to Policy DM1 and guidance set out in the Trees and Development SPD.
Environmental Health (Noise):	Holding Objection. Wildern Lane is typically a busy road, and noise from road traffic can potentially have an adverse impact to the new residents of the proposed development. Even though the 20mph road improves noise, the traffic volume/flow can contribute significantly to high noise levels. Therefore, we have a holding objection on this application until the applicant can provide an adequate noise impact assessment that demonstrates that significant adverse noise impacts can be avoided, and noise impacts managed to acceptable levels.
Environmental Health (Pollution):	No objection in principle but recommends a condition requiring site investigations to be undertaken prior to commencement and a verification report provided prior to occupation. Submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is also recommended.
Urban Design:	Objection. - Insufficient information has been provided to show the proposals in context making it difficult to fully assess its impact. - The proposal is trying to squeeze too much into the site in a way which negatively effects the amenity of existing and future residents. - There appears to be little usable external amenity space for the proposed dwellings which with also put pressure on the few existing trees on site.

	- More information needed on sustainable measures.
Ecology:	Objection. The Planning Design and Access Statement (3.2) states that the SO Ecology report(s?) have informed the design and layout of the proposal, however I don't see this reflected in the proposed site plan. I raise an objection to this application until the site plan reflects the site layout as proposed in the Ecological Impact Assessment report by SO Ecology (May 2023). The Compensation and Enhancement Plan in section 8.4 (dated 27/4/23) has been designed to demonstrate sufficient compensation for loss of habitat as well as areas of habitat enhancement. The vegetation shown on the proposed site plan does not include the hedgerow on the northern boundary, or any scrub, either inside or outside the red line boundary, which is essential habitat to be retained and enhanced on site. Green infrastructure/ wildlife habitat must be continuous around the perimeter of the site, with the same size and extent as proposed in the Ecological Impact Assessment report. The Arboricultural Implications plan (8/11/23) shows that the southern corner of the proposed building would intrude on the root protection zone and canopy of tree 2. As this proposed building is 2 stories high, this would be a significant intrusion. The site plan does not show the same distances from the trees or the southern boundary as the Arboricultural Implications plan. This site is within an amber impact risk zone for great crested newts. There are records of bats, common lizards near this site.
Hampshire Highways:	No objection. No objection from a highway perspective. The additional traffic movements are not anticipated to have any significant impact upon traffic flows and can be accommodated via the existing access to Wildern Lane. Servicing arrangements are to remain unaltered, however, no details of bin collection points are shown. Parking provision is for EBC to assess. Whilst the submitted transport note states that sufficient parking is available, no plan of the overall parking has been provided to verify this statement. Proposed parking spaces appear to be workable. However, it would be beneficial if the end spaces were afforded an additional 0.3 metres of hardstanding width to make it easier to step out of vehicles without standing on landscaping and would also assist in future provision of disabled bays should they be required. Submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is also recommended.
Site Visit:	Yes ☒ No ☐
08/01/2024 – See separate photographs.	

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 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM6, DM8, DM10, DM11, DM13, DM14, DM23, DM25, DM29 and DM30.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals; Trees and Development; Accommodation for Elderly People and Those in Need of Care; Biodiversity.

Assessment:**Proposals:**

The application seeks consent for the construction of four one bedroom retirement flats within a single two storey block, together with associated parking, amenity space and landscaping.

Site Context:

The application site is linked to the existing Willow Mead retirement flats, a development of 36 flats built in the late 1980s. The site is an unused 'spur' of land positioned between the main Willow Mead development and Wildern Lane. As identified by the Council's Environmental Health Team, the site originally formed the access to a farm which was previously on the main site. This is evident from the shape and form of immediate boundaries.

To the immediate north of the site is a 1960s two storey detached dwelling know as 'Palavas'. The southern boundary of the site is marked by a paved public footpath which serves a 1990s housing estate to the south and west. To either side of this footpath are landscaped verges, together with a sizable pond to the south-west. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Wildern Lane is Shamblehurst Primary School, with Wildern Secondary School behind this. The presence of these schools and the community facilities associated with them, together with Wildern Lane being the only north-south route through this part of Hedge End, makes Wildern Lane a busy and well used route for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.

The site itself is orientated roughly north-west to south-east, parallel to the public footpath. Boundary treatment consists of a roughly two metre high hedge along the northern boundary with Palavas, with taller and denser shrubbery to the eastern end onto Wildern Lane. In contrast, the southern boundary with the footpath is very open, only being marked by a very basic post and wire fence. The western end of the site adjoins part of the parking area for the main Willow Mead development and is again very open. Just outside the southern edge of the site are a pair of mature Oak trees which are subject to preservation orders. There are further trees on the opposite side of the footpath and to the west of the site and around the pond which all contribute to an attractive green pocket within the housing estate.

In terms of topography, the site lies approximately a metre lower than the main Willow Mead development to the north-west and at around the same level as the public footpath, which was partly flooded at the time of the case officer's site visit. This appears to be an ongoing problem given the comments received, and indeed the application site did appear to be very wet and waterlogged.

Policy & Principle:

The application site lies within the urban edge where the basic principle of development is acceptable. The site is also within a predominantly residential area, meaning that again

there is no objection in principle to further residential development. However, any formal planning approval will be dependant upon how well that proposed is considered to accord with the relevant adopted local plan policies and supplementary guidance. In this instance the main policies to be considered are DM1, DM6, DM8, DM11, DM25 and DM29.

Policy DM1 requires new development to have no unacceptable impact upon the “amenities of new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas, the countryside and the coast”, make efficient use of the site, as well as “take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.” It goes on to state that “Where adjoining development is poor in urban design terms, new development should contribute to improving the character of the area”.

Policy DM6 requires all new development to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and wherever feasible, naturalised filtration should be included within the treatment train.

Policy DM8 states that “Development will not be permitted if it is likely to cause loss of amenity or impact on public health or other unacceptable environmental impacts through: a) air pollution (including odours or particulate emissions); b) pollution of surface, underground, coastal waters or other watercourses; c) noise or vibration; d) light intrusion, both generally and with respect to the South Downs National Park’s status as an International Dark Night Skies reserve; or e) land contamination.” It goes on to state that “Development susceptible to particular forms of pollution will not be permitted... where it will be adversely affected by such pollution, unless measures can be taken that adequately mitigate the polluting effects”.

Policy DM11 relates to nature conservation and requires the impact of development upon areas of nature conservation interest to be appropriately protected and/or mitigated, with the level of mitigation required being dependent upon the importance of the nature conservation interest.

Policy DM25 relates to the provision of housing for older people. It states that “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.” It goes on to set out that “Proposals should: be located in sustainable locations with good access to the public transport network; close to local facilities that residents can use, ideally Extra Care housing should be in or close to local centre; and well integrated into the local community.” Connected to this is DM29 which requires that all development should meet the higher national access standards as set out in Part M of the building regulations for new residential development.

Form, Scale, Layout & Design:

In terms of general form and scale, that proposed reflects the traditional pitched roofs and two storey scale of surrounding development. Its appearance, being finished in brick with tiled roof, again reflects this same general character. However, there are a number of concerns in relation to both the internal and external layout of that proposed, as well as its resulting impact upon the public realm and visual character of the immediate locality.

Concern has been raised by the Council’s Urban Design Officer, Hedge End Town Council and neighbours that the scheme would result in an overdevelopment of the site. These concerns are not unfounded and are demonstrated by the very limited space around the proposed flat block, particularly along its northern side where it could result in damage to the existing hedge, and western elevation which is only a metre or so away from the proposed parking spaces. The southern corner of the block also encroaches into the canopy and root protection area of the adjacent protected Oak tree (this is more accurately shown on the site plan provided in support of the arboricultural report). In terms of external amenity space, the only potentially useable space is to the eastern end of the

site. However, there appears to be no direct access to this for future residents, and the quality of this area for recreational use is questioned given its close proximity to Wildern Lane, the shading by the protected Oaks, and the very wet ground conditions of the site.

All these points, whilst relatively minor in isolation, cumulatively demonstrate that the site is not capable of accommodating the scale of development proposed without resulting in harm in one form or another. As such it is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM1 and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Street Scene & Area Character:

The submitted elevations show the proposed flat block siting on flat and level ground. However, as set out above, the site is not flat, or at least sits at a lower level than neighbouring development to the north and west. It is unclear with the information submitted whether the intention is for the block to sit at the lower level of the site or closer to the higher level of the adjacent parking area from where it would be accessed. If it is the lower level, then this raises concerns as to how future residents, who may have mobility issues, would be able to access the block without having to negotiate a steep incline or steps. Equally, if it is at the higher level, then this raises concerns in terms of the overall height of the development and how it would impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring property to the north and upon the street scene/public realm.

In either case it is not considered that the proposed development presents the most attractive of elevations to the public realm. Of all the proposed elevations, the southern elevation is the least attractive, consisting of a number of disjointed projecting elements and roof lines, as well as being predominantly blank in terms of fenestration. Even if new boundary treatment or planting along the southern edge of the site were to be added, which is currently unclear, this would do little to alleviate what is an unattractive and potentially imposing elevation onto a well-used public footpath.

In terms of the general character of the locality, that proposed would do little to enhance the visual amenity of the immediate locality and would appear as a cramped and potentially oppressive and overbearing structure. As such it is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM1 and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Amenity:

Existing neighbours:

Objections have been received from a number of immediate neighbours who have raised concerns in relation to loss of privacy, light and outlook, as well as disturbance during and after construction.

With regards to privacy, whilst windows are shown at first floor level on the northern elevation, these can be conditioned as obscure glazed, meaning that there would be no loss of privacy to Palavas. However, whilst there would be no actual loss of privacy, there would certainly be a perceived loss of privacy as a result of the position of these windows, which would be above the existing boundary hedge. This would be added to by the very close proximity of the block's northern elevation to the boundary.

In terms of light, without details of exactly what level the block would sit, it is not possible to accurately assess the impact of overshadowing upon Palavas. However, given the very close proximity of that proposed, its two storey scale, the minimal distance from Palavas and orientation, it is very likely that there would be a significant degree of overshadowing of its garden and conservatory which sits at the southern end of the dwelling. For the same reasons, it is also very likely that the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the outlook from the rear and southern elevations of Palavas, as well as result in a very imposing structure which would impact the enjoyment of its rear garden. For these reasons alone, that proposed is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy DM1 and the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD and should be refused.

With regards to other neighbours, it is acknowledged that the south-eastern elevation would look towards the rear of properties in Coltsfoot Close (which are not shown on any

of the submitted drawings). However, the distance between facing windows appears to meet the minimum requirement of 22 metres as set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD. Equally, the distance between the north-western elevation and closest windows within the main block of Willow Mead exceed this minimum distance.

As to disturbance during construction, these concerns are noted and were the application recommended for approval, conditions could be imposed requiring details of how this impact would be mitigated through the submission and approval of a CEMP, as well as restrictions in terms of working hours, burning, etc.

Future occupiers:

Concerns in relation to the useability and suitability of the external amenity space have been set out above. Albeit this is based on the assumption that this is the intended purpose of the land at the eastern end of the site. If it is not, then it raises concern that no useable external amenity space is being proposed.

With regards to the internal environment created, whilst all four flats exceed the minimum floor area requirement of 39 square metres set out by Policy DM30 for one bedroom units, at 45 and 50 square metres, it takes more that floor space to create an acceptable quality of environment. Of equal importance is the quality of natural light and outlook available. As discussed above, concerns have been raised with regards to the very close proximity of the block to a pair of protected Oaks. This proximity will result in a significant degree of shading, which in turn will limit the level of natural light entering the pair of flats to the south-eastern end of the proposed block. In addition, whilst an outlook onto trees can be attractive, the canopy of these trees will very likely obscure much of the outlook from the closest windows.

Whilst light is less of a concern for the pair of flats facing north-west, the outlook from these flats would be dominated by the parking area for Willow Mead. This would be more so for the ground floor flat which would have a pair of parking spaces 1.5 metres from its bedroom and living room windows. They would also look onto a small substation. Compared to the attractive outlook enjoyed by flats within the existing Willow Mead development, that proposed would be of a much poorer quality to the detriment of future occupiers. As such, that proposed is not considered to be of the design quality required by Policy DM1 and the Council's 'Quality Places' and 'Accommodation for Elderly People and Those in Need of Care' SPDs.

The poor arrangement proposed demonstrates a lack of thought as to the resulting quality of environment for future occupiers. This is concerning given that the development is intended for retired persons and the elderly, many of whom due to various circumstances, will likely spend much of their time inside their flats. As such, it is extremely important that the quality of both internal and external environment is of an appropriate quality. It is equally concerning that this design has been put forward for a site which benefits from attractive views of the pond to the south of the site, as well as the public footpath where residents could 'watch the world go by' and have a better connection with the local community.

Parking, Access & Highways:

The highway impact and suitability of the existing site access has been assessed by Hampshire Highways, who have raised no objection in these respects. However, concerns have been raised by objectors and within the highways response that there would be insufficient parking to accommodate the additional flat units. However, very limited information in relation to the wider parking situation has been provided in support of the application.

A Highway Technical Note has been provided which touches on parking and suggests that the 29 spaces currently available within the Willow Mead development is sufficient to meet the standards set out within the Council's 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD. This may be the case if the development is classed as being 'Active elderly with warden control' and having more than 50% of spaces unallocated. However, it is unclear if the proposed

development or the existing Willow Mead development would fall within this category, i.e. is the development covered by a warden or is it simply a development for the over 55s. It is also unclear what percentage of the existing parking provision is allocated to specific flats and/or reserved for disabled or emergency parking such as doctors and ambulances, as has been highlighted by existing residents.

Without any definitive information to set out the present parking situation and how it is allocated, it is not possible for the LPA to adequately assess whether that proposed will require additional parking provision and/or impact the existing provision for current Willow Mead residents. It has not therefore been demonstrated that adequate parking provision already exists or can be provided to meet the needs of the existing and proposed development. As such, the application is considered to be contrary to Policy DM14 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD and will form a further reason for refusal.

An additional issue related to access is the arrangement proposed around the entrance to the flat block. The submitted site layout shows a parking space only a metre away from the entrance, and with doors having to open outwards for fire escape purposes, this would make access to the entrance rather awkward, particularly for those with mobility issues or who need to use a mobility scooter. This is a further example of a lack of thought as to the needs of those who would be using and living in the proposed development.

Trees & Nature Conservation:

As has been clearly set out in the Council's Tree Consultant's response, there is significant concern that the proposed development will result in unacceptable harm to the adjacent protected Oak trees, through both incursion into the root protection areas and through future pressure to prune their canopies due to adverse impact upon the amenity of occupiers of the development. Any loss or damage to these protected trees would be unacceptable and adversely impact the visual amenity of the public footpath and character of the wider locality, contrary to Policy DM1 and the Council's 'Quality Places' and 'Trees and Development' SPDs. As such this will form a further reason for refusal.

With regards to nature conservation, a number of significant discrepancies between the supporting Ecological Appraisal and submitted drawings have been highlighted. Whilst there is no particular objection to the content of the ecology information submitted or the recommendations within that, it is evident that the advice provided has not been carried over into the layout and design of that proposed. Subsequently, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposed development will not result in any unacceptable harm upon local biodiversity or habitat, or that suitable mitigation can be provided, contrary to Policy DM11. This will form a further reason for refusal.

Nitrates & Phosphates:

Natural England have advised that the increase in wastewater from new housing developments within the borough is having a detrimental effect on the quality of water entering the Itchen and Solent catchment areas through nitrification. As such all developments for additional housing are required to reach nutrient neutrality (ensuring that development does not add to existing nutrient burdens), in order to meet the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

The application site would use the Peel Common wastewater treatment works, which discharges into The Solent. As such the proposed development is required to achieve nutrient neutrality for its resulting nitrogen impact. Eastleigh Borough Council does have a scheme which takes land out of agricultural uses and creates recreational spaces, thus reducing the nutrient output of the land. This scheme would be available to the applicant, although they have not confirmed if they intend to make use of this scheme or provide another form of mitigation. In either case, no mitigation has been secured and will therefore form a further reason for refusal.

Recreational Disturbance:

The site is within the 13.8km catchment area for the New Forest Special Protection Area. It is recognised that new housing developments within this catchment area is likely to result in additional visitors to these protected sites. Again, Eastleigh Borough Council has set up a mitigation strategy to address this issue which would be available to the applicant.

The site falls inside the 5.6km buffer zone for the Solent SPA. It is recognised that new housing developments within these catchment areas are likely to result in additional visitors to these protected sites.

In order to mitigate for these impacts, the developer would need to provide contributions towards the Solent Recreational Disturbance Strategy and the Council's New Forest Mitigation Strategy (which provides Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces within the borough). However, as the application is being refused for other reasons, these contributions have not been requested but will form a further reason for refusal for the purposes of any subsequent planning appeal.

Habitats Regulations:

Any proposed residential development in this area will have a likely impact upon The Solent SPAs. As such, an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations needs to be completed and reviewed by Natural England if the LPA is minded to approve an application. However, as the intention is to refuse the application, no assessment has been undertaken.

Drainage & Flooding:

As discussed above, the application site appears to suffer from waterlogging and drainage problems. It is unclear if this is as a result of neighbouring development, or if it is a historic issue, given its close proximity to the adjacent pond, which existed prior to the development of the surrounding area. In either case it is considered necessary to undertake a more detailed assessment of the present situation and how that proposed could impact the application site and immediately surrounding sites. It is unclear if any such assessment has been undertaken (no drainage information has been provided in support of the application) although as has been pointed out by one of the neighbour comments received, the 'soakaway' option has been ticked in the drainage section of the application form. Given the very wet condition of the site at the time of the case officer's visit, and based on other comments received, including from the town council, it is unlikely that filtration drainage is going to be a feasible option for the application site.

Whilst it may be possible to require drainage details via conditions of a planning approval, given the obvious issues and importance of preventing flooding of the adjacent public footpath, it is considered that at the minimum some form of site assessment and drainage strategy should have been provided in support of the application. Without such information the LPA cannot adequately assess the potential impact of that proposed or be sure that the requirements of Policy DM6 can be met. As such this will form a further reason for refusal.

Noise:

The close proximity of Wildern Lane, which is a very busy road, and the impact of traffic noise upon future occupiers of the development has been raised as a concern by the Council's Environmental Health Team. Whilst Wildern Lane has a 20mph speed limit and speed calming measure along much of its length, the quantity of traffic using the lane will have a noise impact. Whilst it may be possible to mitigate any impact, without an initial noise assessment to demonstrate the current impact, it is not possible to fully assess whether mitigation is required or what form this may take. Given no noise assessment has been submitted in support of the application, it cannot be demonstrated if the requirements of Policy DM8 can be met in this respect. As such, this will form a further reason for refusal.

Servicing:

Concern has been raised by neighbours within the existing Willow Mead development that the existing bin storage and refuse collection facilities are not adequate for the existing development, and that further residential units will only add to these problems. Whilst the LPA has no evidence to confirm this, equally, no definitive information has been provided in support of the application which demonstrates how the proposed new flat units would be serviced or that the existing facilities can deal with the increased quantities of refuse created. As such it has not been demonstrated that the requirements of Policy DM1 (j) can be met and will form a further reason for refusal.

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, development plan and adopted local plan policy 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 adopted 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, 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 reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

No information has been provided to demonstrate what if any sustainability measures would be included within the development. Whilst there may be scope for PV panels on the southern roof slope, these are unlikely to be very efficient given the level of shading which would be caused by the adjacent mature Oaks.

Equalities Implications:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 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.

Conclusion:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐**REFUSE** ☒

Given the concerns and issues set out above, the application is recommended for refusal on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment of the site and the resulting impact upon the public realm and visual amenity and character of the locality.
- Impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring property, 'Palavas', with regards to loss of light, outlook and perceived loss of privacy.
- The resulting poor quality living environment for future occupiers as a result of the poor outlook and levels of natural light.
- Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that adequate parking provision is currently available or can be created to serve the proposed and existing Willow Mead development.
- Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the development will not result in unacceptable harm to protected trees.
- Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the development will not result in unacceptable harm to local biodiversity or habitat.
- Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that adequate surface water drainage to serve the development can be provided in a manner which will not result in increased flooding of neighbouring properties and the adjacent public footpath.
- Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that future occupiers of the development will not be adversely impacted by traffic noise from Wildern Lane.
- Insufficient evidence to demonstrate that suitable refuse storage can be provided to serve the proposed development.
- Failure to provide mitigation for the development's impact upon The Solent and New Forest SPAs from recreational disturbance.
- Failure to provide mitigation for the development's impact upon the water quality of The Solent SPA.