

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/25/100301

Site Address: 46 STATION ROAD, NETLEY ABBEY, SOUTHAMPTON, SO31 5AF

Case Officer: Charlie Vallis

Description: Erection of 4no. bedroom dwelling parking and new access drive for proposed and existing bungalow

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within the urban edge Within Solent and New Forest recreational impact zones		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
<u>Additional dwelling at front of site</u> - F/21/91298 – Construction of 1no. four-bedroom detached house with parking, landscaping and access off Station Road. Relocation of windows on existing bungalow – Permitted (Nov 2021) - F/21/90127 – Construction of 1no. four-bedroom detached house with parking, landscaping and access off Station Road. Relocation of windows on existing bungalow – Withdrawn (July 2021). - F/19/86928 – Construction of 5no. dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling – Withdrawn (Feb 2020) - F/15/76334 – Erection of 1no. 3 bed detached dwelling with associated access, parking and amenity space, together with alterations – Permitted (June 2015) - F/12/70173 – Erection of three bed detached dwelling with associated access, parking and amenity space – Permitted (Apr 2012). <u>Additional dwelling at rear of site</u> - F/13/73661 – Construction of detached single storey two bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space – Refused (Jan 2014). - F/12/71668 – Erection of 1no. 3 bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space in rear garden – Refused (Dec 2012) <u>Other</u> - F/12/71193 – Loft conversion and two storey rear extension to incorporate annexe – Refused (Sep 2012) - F/07/61334 – Construction of two storey building to accommodate 4no. one bedroom apartments with new access, parking & bin store, following demolition of existing bungalow – Permitted (Dec 2007)		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☒
Representations:	2no. letters of objection and 1no. letter of comment received (summarised below): No.44 Station Road (Objection): - Size and proximity of house will dominate their property and result in loss of light and privacy. - Width of access road inadequate and parking arrangement considered unworkable, with access likely to cause damage to boundary fencing and parking likely to result in excessive noise and vehicle fumes in close proximity to the neighbour's windows. - Would add to local traffic issues. - Level differences between properties and its gradual sloping site has caused land slippage, potentially worsened by the		

	development. A retaining wall would be required to be built by the applicant to protect neighbouring fencing. No.48 Station Road (Objection): • Fails to respond to local context and is not in-keeping with the scale, character or appearance of the area. • Departs from pattern of single plot properties, results in incongruous, cramped development. Harms visual amenity. • Existing parking/traffic issues along the road. Would generate additional traffic on unsuitable road/access point. • Disruption through road closure to access sewer and water lines. • Restriction of light to solar panels, and light and outlook to a main bedroom window facing SW and rear patio. Loss of light assessment absent. • Removal of existing hedgerows providing visual amenity and important for habitats for nesting birds. No.51 Station Road (Comment): • Concerned about the likely removal of hedgerow at the property's frontage. Hedge provided a nesting/breeding place for sparrows (on the Red List of Conservation Concern). • Request that the retention (not replacement) of this hedge is a condition of any approval.
Parish Council:	No Objection
Highways (HCC):	No Objection in principle to the proposals, subject to a minor update to the access and conditions being applied It is proposed that the access will be switched from the left of the site (when looking at the site from Station Road) to the right hand side. This would be acceptable in principle, however the proposed access is shown as only 3.0m wide. Given it is a shared access off a relatively busy road, it should be widened to the maximum permissible width, noting it will be flanked either side by BT apparatus (cabinet and ground covers), which appears to be approximately 4.6m. This will enable two way vehicle movements to be achieved through the access, preventing the potential need for an entering vehicle to have to wait on Station Road if another is leaving site at the same time. Drawings should be updated accordingly to demonstrate this widened width. Whilst the quantum of parking has not been assessed, as this is a function for EBC as Local Parking authority, whereby the EBC Parking Standards will need to be adhered to, the layout of parking has been reviewed and is acceptable. Parking spaces are of adequate width, and whilst the turning aisle is slightly below 6.0m, this is compensated by a widened parking area that will allow for early turning to enable on site manoeuvres and forward gear access and egress to be achieved.
Tree Officer:	There are no significant trees in the area of the proposed development. However, under a previous application (F/21/90127), it was brought to our attention that two replacement trees have not been planted in the exiting curtilage in replacement for an oak and a silver birch that were removed under what then s.198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (now section 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations. Evidence has now shown that the oak has been replaced to the rear.

	Ultimately, we have no arboricultural concerns, but would like to see a tree to replace the lost birch. A replacement has been indicated on the plans, but there is a lack of detail and the position is rather tight. Ideally we would like to see a tree to the front, although this will potentially require specialist driveway to allow roots to grow underneath (e.g. Silva Cell or RootSpace). Therefore, we raise no arboricultural objection to the proposal, subject to a condition requiring details of the replacement tree.
Ecology:	I have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Dr Jonty Denton (November 2025). There is negligible/limited potential for protected species on site, and the proposal would not result in any impacts on nearby designated sites. Biodiversity enhancements will be required in accordance with Local Plan policy DM 11 and NPPF (December 2024) paragraphs 187d and 192 b. A bat box and a swift nest box may be appropriate for this building. Biodiversity Net Gain: The Small Sites Metric (SSM) has been used to assess Biodiversity Net Gain. It would result in the loss of a small area of species poor amenity grassland (- 0.0082 units), and loss of 5m of ornamental hedge which would be replaced with a native hedge. The species composition of the hedge can be agreed before determination or can be conditioned. A trading summary has been produced, and off-site compensation will be required. This can be purchased after determination, however evidence of the availability of units and the intention to purchase them can be provided before determination. The procedures outlined in the EBC Biodiversity Planning Guidance note should be followed. This is available on our webpage Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain for Planning Applications Surface water drainage: A soakaway, rainwater storage butt, with permeable block paving in the driveway is considered satisfactory.
Urban Design Officer:	Reiterated comments from Urban Design Officer under previous application no. F/21/91298: - No objection to construction of a dwelling in principle or proposed layout. - Amendments to the front elevation are required to ensure the prevailing character of this part of the village is protected and enhanced.
Natural England:	Natural England objects to this proposal. As submitted, we consider it will have an adverse effect on the integrity of the New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site from increased recreational disturbance. The impacts are also likely to affect the features of the associated Sites of Special Scientific Interest which underpin the above habitats site designations. Further advice on designated sites/landscapes and advice on other natural environment issues also provided.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 09/02/2026		

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, DM11, DM13, DM14, DM23, DM29 and DM30.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Bursledon, Hamble and Hound Character Area Appraisals (BHH 1).

Assessment:Principle and planning history:

The site is located within the urban edge where residential development is acceptable in principle under Policies S2 and DM23 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016–2036 (EBLP). The site is in a sustainable location close to shops and transport links, where the EBLP and NPPF encourage the efficient use of land.

This application comes following the expiry of F/21/91298 (permitted in November 2021) for an identical proposal, under which the principle of this development was accepted.

Site and proposal:

The application site contains a detached bungalow, set-back significantly from the road on a large plot. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, largely made up of two-storey dwellings, with a small parade of shops further along the road.

The application seeks approval for the construction of a two storey 4-bedroom dwelling to the front of the site, with a parking area alongside Station Road and garden to the rear. The existing bungalow would be retained at the rear of the site and its internal layout amended. A new access would be created from Station Road and previous access closed off, with a driveway alongside its western boundary leading to a new parking area for the bungalow.

Character and appearance

The scale and positioning of the dwelling would follow the prevailing pattern of development along Station Road, sitting along the established building line within a perceived gap between no's 44 and 48. Details of previous urban design comments under F/21/91298 have been provided, where a holding objection was raised requiring amendments to the detailing of the front elevation, to better complement surrounding properties. However, with some variation noted in the design of neighbouring buildings and given that the design was previously accepted and design guidance has not since significantly changed, amendments to the current proposal were not deemed necessary.

The proposed dwelling would be an improvement over the existing recessed bungalow in terms of its integration with properties along Station Road. The current bungalow appears out of keeping with the shallow set-backs characteristic of this area and its form is at odds with the prevailing pattern of development. Overall, the design, materials, features and scale of the proposal are considered to sit comfortably within the street scene of Station Road.

The proposal would not be an overdevelopment of the site. The size of the new dwelling meets the nationally described space standards (NDSS) and sufficient outdoor amenity space would be provided for the new and existing dwellings. Initially, a bedroom was noted as falling below the requirements of the NDSS. Amended plans were requested and have been provided altering this bedroom to a more useable size and layout.

Residential amenity:

In relation to residential amenity, there has been no material alteration to the site circumstances or to local planning policy and supplementary planning guidance in relation to residential amenity since its previous planning permission. The development is therefore not likely to result in an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.

No primary windows will be positioned on the side elevations to prevent direct overlooking to the two adjoining properties (no.44 or no.48). First floor rear facing windows would not result in unacceptable loss of privacy, with a degree of overlooking accepted and expected in urban areas.

In terms of its impact on the existing bungalow, there will be a distance of approx. 12m between the rear windows of the proposed dwelling and existing bungalow.

Reconfigurations to the bungalow, shown on the Proposed Plot Plan, alter the layout so that no primary windows would be on the front elevation – with bedroom windows looking onto side boundary treatments and its main living areas having an outlook onto their rear garden. As such, impacts on their privacy, light and outlook are not considered unacceptable.

The house would be positioned next to the boundary with no.48, which has 2no. small secondary side windows facing the application site. One of these windows serves a habitable room (bedroom), however its primary source of light and outlook from the rear would remain undisturbed. Comments have been noted around restriction of light to solar panels, however, the comparatively low positioning of the proposed dwelling is such that this impact is not considered unacceptable. These solar panels were also in place during the assessment of the previous planning permission.

In relation to no.44, the proposed dwelling would be sited on the opposite side of the plot, with a distance of approx. 6m from the side wall of this dwelling. No.44 is on a lower ground level and has ground floor side windows facing the site. However, the level of impact on the neighbours side windows is not considered unacceptable, with sufficient separation distance between the two properties. Levels details will be required via condition, to help prevent ground slippage.

Parking and highway safety:

The parking arrangements for the proposed and existing dwelling comply with the Council's Parking Standards SPD. The access drive at 3m wide is considered to provide sufficient manoeuvring space to turn a vehicle parked on the front of the site and for vehicles to access the rear dwelling. Whilst having parking for the bungalow at the rear of the site is not an optimal arrangement, as this serves just one property any disturbance from vehicles is likely to be at an acceptable level in a residential area.

Although the Local Highway Authority recommended widening the proposed access point, this has not been requested, with highway related policy not materially altering since the previous application, and the width of the driveway considered acceptable given that it would serve 2no. properties.

Ecology and trees:

Although concerns have been raised by neighbours regarding the loss of the hedge, guided by responses from the Council's Tree Officer and Ecologist, the development is not considered to result in adverse impacts upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention. A replacement tree will be required, in accordance with the advice of the Tree Officer, and a landscaping scheme is to be secured via condition.

As proposals would result in a net increase in 1no. dwelling, the application must demonstrate that a 10% biodiversity net gain can be achieved. As such, the Small Sites

Metric (SSM) has been used to assess Biodiversity Net Gain. Additional and replacement hedgerow have been proposed, and a trading summary has produced, with off-site compensation required to fulfil this statutory requirement. Conditions have been proposed to ensure the relevant on-site biodiversity enhancements are in place and the required off-site units/credits are purchased.

Impact on SPA:

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. In this case, this would specifically be the European protected Solent Complex (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites) and New Forest National Park (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites). It is recognised that the addition of residential development would have an adverse impact upon the surrounding designated European protected sites.

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. Necessary mitigation for nitrate inputs will be secured via condition.

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. There is a monetary mitigation fee dependant on the number of bedrooms, which has been paid upfront.

Furthermore, Natural England raises concern with regard to additional residential development within 13.8km radius of the New Forest. The net increase in dwellings is considered to have an adverse impact upon the New Forest by way of additional trips resulting in further recreational disturbance. Monetary mitigation has been paid upfront in accordance with the Council's Interim New Forest Recreation Mitigation strategy.

Natural England raised an objection, but only to the Council's New Forest Mitigation. However, the LPA, as the competent body under the Habitats and Species Regulations (2019) are satisfied that the mitigation proposed is sufficient to address the impacts arising from the development upon European Protected Sites. The Council has notified Natural England of its intention to grant permission pursuant to Section 281 (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) and allowed the 21 days necessary prior to this recommendation to grant permission.

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; (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.

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 ☐

Comments ...