

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/24/96952

Site Address: 87 Swaythling Road, West End, Southampton, SO30 3AG

Case Officer: Gary Osmond

Description: Erection of 3-bedroom detached dwelling and associated landscaping following demolition of existing garage.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
- Within urban edge - Solent protection recreational disturbance - HRA screening; River, SAC, SPA & Ramsar - Great Crested Newt – Green Zone - TPO (Group Area 91-E) (west) - Surface Water Flooding & Flood Zones 2 & 3 (west – along Eden Road)		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Z/31765/002/00	Construction of dropped kerb	Permitted (June 2001)
H/20/88618	Two-storey rear extension, hip to gable extension, front and rear dormer and elevational alterations	Permitted (November 2020)
H/21/89891	Two-storey front and rear extensions, hip to gable extension, front and rear dormer, single and first floor rear extension and elevational alterations	Permitted (April 2021)
H/22/92484	Part retrospective 2.6m boundary treatment change	Permitted (May 2021)
H/22/93282	Part retrospective erection of lean-to structure on side for ancillary storage	Permitted (October 2022)

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>2no. Objections summarised as follows:</u> (a) access concerns, (b) environmental impact, (c) loss of privacy, (d) disruption and pollution, (e) property devaluation, and (f) structural risks.		
Parish Council:	No comments received.		
EBC Arboriculturalist:	There are no significant trees on site, despite part of it being covered by a 1984 Area Order. This Order was clearly meant to protect the much more significant specimens to the south (ie. behind 74-70 Eden Road). Any offsite trees must be considered, but we have no received any arboricultural information. At this stage we will require suitable arboricultural information to allow us to fully assess the proposals. Therefore we raise a holding objection and request that suitable arboricultural information, as per British Standard 5837, is submitted.		
EBC Ecology:	This site is located in a green impact risk zone for great crested newts. There are records of bats and hedgehogs very close to this site. Current photos of the site are required which show the existing vegetation and the garage proposed to be demolished.		

	It must be demonstrated before determination that biodiversity net gain will be possible on this site. This can be shown in a landscaping plan or separate biodiversity net gain plan. A surface water drainage plan is also required. If a soakaway is proposed, a soil infiltration test will be required if there is no evidence of a working soakaway on site.
EBC Contaminated Land:	Historical maps and aerial imagery indicate that the site has not been previously developed, apart from the structure at the back of 87 Swaythling Road which appears to have been in situ from at least 1999. The applicant did not provide any details on the type of structure and its materials (i.e. it could contain asbestos). Most recent aerial imagery indicates the site has been subject to changes possible due to extension works undertaken in the main dwelling from 2021. Historical brickworks were identified immediately to the west boundary of the site (including proposed access area). It is recommended a watching brief should be maintained at all times during demolition and construction works for unexpected contaminated, and a condition in relation to imported soils, as well as an informative with regard to radon risk.
EBC Environmental Health:	Noise: Construction will elevate noise, vibration and dust causing temporary adverse impact. As such, a CEMP should be secured via condition. Air Quality: The proposed development does not represent a significant impact on air quality. Therefore we have no objection in this regard. However, we stress the importance of adopting best practices and measures to safeguard air quality in the area. The developer should ensure that the proposed development aligns with air quality objectives during construction works, promoting a healthy and sustainable environment.

Policy:

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Practice Guidance

Development Plan:

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

Policies: S1 (sustainable development), S2 (approach to development), S3 (location of new housing), DM1 (general development), DM2 (environmentally sustainable development), DM3 (climate change), DM4 (zero or low carbon energy), DM6 (surface water management), DM8 (pollution), DM10 (water & waste water), DM11 (nature conservation), DM13 (access), DM14 (parking), DM23 (residential development within urban areas), DM24 (Creating a mix of housing), DM29 (dwellings with higher access standards), DM30 (internal space standards), and DM38 (funding infrastructure).

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area Appraisal, and Trees and Development.

Site Visit

Yes ☒

No ☐

Date: 10/04/2024. See separate site photographs. Photographs were taken from the exterior of the site as the existing building did not appear to be safe to enter.

Assessment:

Site & Surroundings

This application relates to the western portion/ land rear of 87 Swaythling Road, which fronts Swaythling Road (A27). The area subject to this application lies at the bottom end of the garden with direct vehicular access onto Eden Road to the west, between neighbouring properties no.78 and no.80 Eden Road.

The site is a backland site set behind Eden Road, currently consisting of a large garage/workshop building together with a section of what appears to be former garden of No.85 Swaythling Road. The site is generally surrounding by vegetation other than where it borders No.87. The site itself appears to be relatively level, however, topography in the immediate area is such that properties along Swaythling Road sit at a much higher level with a retaining wall forming the eastern site boundary.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with identified pieces of public open space within close proximity (recreational ground to the north of Barnsland and Hatch Farm Play Area/ West End Skate Park). The residential properties differ in terms of their height, size and scale, although it is noted that there is some cohesion with specific styles of dwelling being grouped together. To the immediate west and south of the application site is a group Tree Preservation Order (91-E).

Proposal

The application proposes the construction of 3-bedroom detached dwelling and associated landscaping following demolition of the existing garage/workshop. This would also result in the subdivision of 87 Swaythling Road, with the dwelling situated to the west.

The proposed dwelling would have a footprint of approx. 78.6m² and would be two-storeys in nature with a maximum height of approx. 7m, and eaves measuring approx. 4.1m. The proposed dwelling would have a hipped roof and have 2no. flat roofed eaves dormers (one to the front and one to the rear), as well as a projecting gabled element to the principal elevation. The proposed dwelling would be finished in a combination of brick, including decorative brick panels, some timber frame, dark grey/black fenestration and brown roof tiles, as well as a substantial chimney which appears to only be for decorative purposes. Boundary treatment would comprise close board fencing and planting atop a 2.0+ metre retaining structure to the east.

Externally two parking spaces would be proposed with a small turning area, together with external amenity space to the rear and side of the dwelling.

Principle

The application site falls within the urban edge, whereby the general principle of residential development is considered to be acceptable. However, this would be subject to the following considerations set out within this report.

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.*

In accordance with the revised NPPF (December 2023), Local Planning Authorities are not required to maintain a five-year housing land supply if they meet the two criteria in paragraph 76. These are a recently adopted Local Plan, that identified at least a five-year supply when the examination concluded.

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan was adopted in April 2022 and the final Inspector's report accepted that the Council met the requirement for a five-year supply. The five-year housing land supply position report published by the Council at that time provides further information on the sources of housing supply. The Council is not therefore required to maintain a five-year housing land supply and the tilted balance will not apply.

Whilst it is noted that the proposal would provide for additional residential development within the urban edge, an area which is acknowledged to be a sustainable location, this contribution would be particularly modest in the form of a single dwelling. Therefore, in light of the Council's 5-Year Housing Land Supply position and in accordance with the NPPF, only a limited degree of weight as a benefit can be given to the scheme.

Form, Layout & Design

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban 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.

In addition to the above Policy, the Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area Appraisal (HEWEB 1) makes reference to the application site and surroundings. The guidance within this section sets out that it would be important to: retain grass verges, mitigate the effects of heavy vehicular traffic on Swaythling Road, maintain the predominant plot widths and retain/ extend the continuity in building line and ensure that new development relates effectively with the building features and materials prominent in existing development. It also notes that the strength of the character is moderate.

The design of the proposed dwelling would be situated within the subdivided curtilage of no.87 Swaythling Road. There does not appear to be any back-land development within the surrounding vicinity, potentially with the exception of Nos.102 & 104 Eden Road, although these do have direct access from the street. Therefore, the introduction of development as proposed would be uncharacteristic of the existing urban grain. Notwithstanding, paragraph 126 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that *planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account: (d) the desirability of maintaining an areas prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens).* Whilst the subdivision of the plot may be acceptable in principle, there is some concern that the particular design and layout of that proposed could sterilise adjoining land which may also be suitable for development.

Turning to the overall design, it is noted that the proposed dwelling has sought design cues from one of the styles of dwelling along Eden Road. However, the proposal would be of a larger size and scale than that of the existing neighbouring dwellings along both Eden and Swaythling Roads, and would therefore not be comparable. The design would also introduce dormers, which are not a particularly characteristic feature of the street scene. From the street scene plan, it is evident that the proposed dwelling would be visible when travelling along Eden Road, albeit set back some distance. However, given its unique design, form and larger scale it would appear as a somewhat incongruous addition which would have an adverse impact upon the street scene and general visual amenity of the

locality. It would also have a significant impact upon the character of the publicly accessible strip of woodland to the west and south of the site, changing it from a green informal walking route to that of something much more urban in character, which would be to its detriment.

Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states '*development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents*'. Due to the inappropriate scale, siting and form of the development, the proposal is considered to result in an incongruous addition, which would have an adversely harmful impact upon the street scene and wider vantage points.

Overall, the proposed dwellinghouse, as a result of its siting and design would result in an unacceptable addition which would appear at odds with the wider vicinity, detracting from the established character and spaciousness of the surroundings, thus being contrary to the abovementioned policies, and SPDs. In accordance with Paragraph 139 of the NPPF, this development is not considered well designed, nor does it reflect local design policies, thus warranting refusal.

Internal & External Space for Future Occupiers

To ensure adequate internal living standards are met the Local Planning Authority assess the measurements of space against the 'Nationally Described Space Standards' (NDSS) (March 2015). Policy DM30 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires that all new dwellings meet the NDSS as a minimum. In addition to internal arrangements, the Quality Places SPD requires all new residential development to provide an appropriate garden area of at least 60% of the host dwelling's floor area.

The NDSS sets out the minimum space required for new dwellinghouses, this is dependent upon the number of bedrooms, bedspaces and storeys. There are also standards relating to sizes of bedrooms; a single occupancy bedroom should measure 7.5m², and a double occupancy bedroom should measure 11.5m².

The application proposes a two-storey three bedroom dwelling, whereby the NDSS requires between 84m² – 102m². From the submitted plans, that proposed would provide approximately 130m² overall which would exceed the NDSS requirements. It is also noted that all bedrooms would exceed double person occupancy. In addition, from the submitted floor plans and elevations, it appears that each habitable room would be served by a window, thus would provide adequate natural light, although a number of the windows are rather small for the size of rooms they serve.

Further, and as set out within the Council's Quality Places SPD, the garden size for new residential development must be at least 60% of the floor space of the host dwellinghouse. Further and in this instance, the 60% amenity space would also be applied to the retained dwelling.

The proposals would have an 'L' shaped garden which would wrap around the proposed dwelling to the south/west. There would also be some amenity space to the rear (east), however it is arguable how 'useable' this space would be given its very shallow depth and the imposing presence of the 2.0 metre high retaining structure. In any event, the garden area to the south/west would provide at least 60% external amenity space, in line with the Councils SPD requirement, albeit would be significantly shaded by the mature trees to the south and west.

Turning to the retained no.87 Swaythling Road, it is noted that this has been subject to previous planning applications which have approved various extensions/ alterations. Taking the footprint of the most recently approved planning application (H/21/89891), the

overall footprint measures approx. 156m². The retained garden area measures approx. 95m². Thus, would just meet the 60% requirement.

To conclude on this aspect, whilst the minimum spatial requirements of the Quality Places SPD are met, there are still significant concerns as to the resulting quality and usability of the internal and external amenity spaces which would be created for future occupiers of the development.

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.

The addition of further residential development within an area characterised by residential is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Starting with no.87 Swaythling Road, it is noted that this site would be subdivided to allow the creation of a detached dwelling in lieu of the existing garage. The Council's Quality Places SPD sets out that there should be a minimum of 22m between first floor habitable room windows (rear to rear) so as not to result in adverse harm/ overlooking. The rear-to-rear distance between the first floor rear window of the proposed dwelling and the closest first floor window of no.87 is 19m thus falling short of this distance. It should be noted that the SPD requires this 22 metre minimum distance to be increased by 5 metres for each additional storey. Given that the application dwelling will sit at least a storey height below No.87, it should be the case that the minimum distance should be increased beyond the 22 metre minimum. It is noted that there is a rear-to-rear distance of approx. 21m between the proposed dwelling and no.85, again falling short of the required 22+ metres set out within the SPD, thus would allow for unacceptable overlooking from existing properties into the proposed dwelling.

As well as the close proximity/ overlooking concerns with no's. 87 and 85, the proposed dwelling would also impact upon no's. 89a and 83. 89a benefits from a long rear garden and therefore the proposed dwelling is not considered to have an adverse impact upon this neighbour. However, due to the shorter garden depth, proposed dimensions, and proximity to the shared southern boundary (approx. 4m) the proposed dwelling is considered to have an adverse impact upon the amenities of no.83 by way of creating a sense of enclosure and being overbearing.

The proposed dwelling would be accessed via an existing access track between Nos. 80 and 78 Eden Road. Regular use of this track by vehicles could result in unwanted disturbance to these properties and their rear gardens. As a result of the access, the proposed dwelling would be set back from these neighbours. Due to the TPO'd trees to the west, the proposals are unlikely to have an adverse impact upon no.78. Due to the siting and separation distance it is also unlikely that the proposals would have an adverse impact upon the amenities of no.80 Eden Road, albeit it would be highly visible from their curtilage.

Turning to noise and pollution, the Council's Environmental Health Team noted that construction would elevate noise, vibration and dust causing temporary adverse impact. Therefore, had the proposals have been acceptable in all other regards a CEMP could have been conditioned.

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.

The Council's Parking SPD sets out that for a property of this size, there is a requirement of 2no. off-street vehicular parking provisions. These are shown to be provided on a driveway. Retained 87 Swaythling Road would also need to be served by adequate parking provisions. From a history search, it is noted that 87 Swaythling Road benefits from a driveway which could accommodate 3no. vehicles, as stated within the Officers previous report (H/21/89891). In addition, suitable bin and cycle storage have also been shown on the submitted plans.

Whilst the parking provisions comply with the Council's SPD, there is some concern with regards to site access and the ability to be able to turn a vehicle on site. Whilst a small turning area is shown, it appears to be very tight and without the benefit of an accurate tracking drawing to confirm otherwise, there is concern that vehicles would need to reverse along the access track to enter or exist the site. In addition to the concerns of disturbance highlighted above, there are also some concerns with regards to pedestrian and highway safety due to the poor sightlines available due to the position and height of fences. The access track forms part of a public footpath owned and managed by the Council, and it is unclear if any consent has been sought or confirmed that the track can be used for the purposes of accessing the site.

With regards to refuse storage and collection, whilst there is room on site, no dedicated bin collection point is shown at the end of the access drive.

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 the proposals, the Council's Ecologist and Arboriculturalist have been consulted.

The Council's Ecologist noted that the site is located in a green impact risk zone for great crested newts, as well as there being records of bats and hedgehogs very close by. They requested photos of the site to show the existing vegetation and garage, as well as noting that a biodiversity net gain would be required to be demonstrated. Had the proposals have been acceptable this information could have been requested and/ or secured via condition.

The Council's Arboriculturalist noted that whilst there are no significant trees on site, there is an area TPO within close proximity to the site, as such any offsite trees must be considered. They requested suitable arboricultural information to be able to fully assess the impact of the proposals upon these protected trees. In the absence of this information, they raised a holding objection. Given the importance of these trees the lack of information would also warrant reason for refusal.

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.

The Council's Ecologist has requested surface water drainage information. Had the proposals have been acceptable in all other regards additional information could have been requested or the information secured via condition.

Sustainability

Policy DM2 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires new development to provide a 19% improvement in predicted carbon emissions, and water consumption standards of 110L per person per day.

Other than being situated within a suitable location, the proposals do not provide any sustainability measures. It should be noted, however, that had the proposals have been acceptable in other regards, these requirements would have been secured via condition.

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), 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 this instance, given that the proposal was unacceptable in other regards no Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken, however an assessment of the impact has been completed below.

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 a 3no. bedroom dwelling would require a monetary mitigation of £875 (as of 1 April 2024). This has not been received.

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. No mitigations have been provided or secured as part of this application with regard to offsetting nutrients.

Furthermore, Natural England has also 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. No mitigation to offset this impact has been provided.

The Local Planning Authority acknowledge that these matters could be overcome, subject

to the correct monies and mitigations being implemented. However, the proposal was not considered acceptable in other regards, therefore this was not sought. As it stands the application does not provide the required mitigations to offset the adverse impact upon the protected areas and therefore these matters would contribute towards a reason for refusal.

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

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF and development plan do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and 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:

Whilst in basic principle the site could be redeveloped for residential purposes, it is not considered suitable for the scale and design of dwelling proposed. That proposed would result in a poor quality environment being created for future occupiers, including

insufficient external amenity space, poor outlook and lack of light due to the overbearing impact of the retaining structure along the eastern boundary, as well as adjacent trees. There is also clear potential for overlooking and loss of privacy from neighbouring dwelling which are situated on higher ground. In addition to this, there appears to be insufficient room to enable a car to turn on site, resulting in vehicles having to reverse up or down the access route, which would raise concerns in terms of pedestrian safety, as well as unnecessary disturbance to Nos. 78 & 80 Eden Road. The height and scale of the building will also have an unacceptable visual impact upon immediate neighbouring properties.

If this site is to be redeveloped, it will be necessary to look at a much more bespoke design which works far better with the particular constraints of the site, rather than trying to force a standardised design into the site. The inclusion of additional neighbouring land to the north may also assist in a larger more comprehensive scheme being secured and prevent the neighbouring land from being sterilised for potential future development.

For the reasons discussed above and set out below, the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒

Reason for Refusal:

- 1) The proposed layout, scale and design of dwelling proposed would result in a cramped and constrained plot of a size which would not provide an appropriate quality private amenity space of a size and shape commensurate with the nature of the dwelling it is intended to serve, or a suitable setting for the dwelling, to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers of the development and out of keeping with the prevailing character of development in the locality. The application is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), as well as the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents 'Quality Places' and the provisions of the NPPF.
- 2) The proposed dwelling, by reason of its siting and close proximity to the eastern and southern boundaries, would result in a sense of enclosure creating an unacceptable and overbearing impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of Nos.83, 85 & 87 Swathling Road, to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of these properties. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), Quality Places SPD (2011), and the provisions of the NPPF (2021).
- 3) Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed dwelling and associated works would not have an adverse impact upon the existing group area TPO adjacent to the site. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), the Council's Trees and Development SPD (2022) and the provisions of the NPPF (2023).
- 4) The application fails to provide the required mitigation to offset the impacts of the development upon the European protected Solent Complex (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites), and New Forest National Park (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites) from additional recreational pressure and nitrogen loading generated by the population increase and additional sewage resulting from the development. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies DM1, DM10 and DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036, the provisions of the NPPF (2023) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

