

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: RM/24/98388

Site Address: Land west of Allbrook Way, Eastleigh, SO50 4LZ

Case Officer: Rebecca Altman

Description: Reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the proposed development pursuant to outline permission O/19/86980 for the construction of 49.no residential dwellings.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Urban Edge • Allocated residential site – AL2 • TPOs in Westfield House front garden • Adjacent to SINC – Allbrook Clay Pit • Right of Way – footpath Allbrook 716 • Minerals – underlying sand/gravel • Great crested newt red and amber zones (medium / high) • Surface water flood risk on Knowle Hill • Adjacent to ELAC Character Area 30 • New Forest mitigation zone • Nitrate and phosphate		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• O/19/86980 – outline planning application for up to 52 residential dwellings (C3 use) with associated landscaping, infrastructure and access from Knowle Hill (all matters reserved except for access) – permitted 5 June 2024 •		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☒
Representations:	Four representations received, raising objection on the following grounds: - Concern about flood risk due to hard surfacing over green field; - Wildlife will be pushed out; - Increased cars, leading to increased traffic congestion; - Increased pressure on local services such as doctors, dentists and schools; - Loss of green space; - Negative impact on the woodland, which has rare plants and habitats; - No need for more housing in the area; - Concern about dominance and overlooking of Westfield House from Plot 9; - Query about whether a footway is being provided along Knowle Hill; - Potential for increased traffic congestion on Knowle Hill; - Increased flood risk; - Query whether there would be provision for high speed broadband; - Concern about impacts on the Itchen SAC from water run off / pollution; - Proposed drainage features do not seem adequate; - Further water run off and pollution concerns during construction period.		

Parish Council:	No comments received.
Tree Officer:	No objection subject to conditions. The arboricultural report (for the most part) satisfactorily demonstrates that the proposals can be implemented without significant harm to the amenity of the area. The proposals are also broadly in line with the approved outline permission. Tree loss – from an amenity perspective, the tree loss is not significantly greater than what has been agreed at outline stage. The site will not be significantly impacted by the proposed tree losses. They will, however, require replacing as per the Tree Replacement Policy contained in the Trees and Development SPD. There appears to be a suitable number of new trees to address the required replacements. Pruning – A relatively large amount of tree pruning is proposed, but most of this is facilitative and not considered significant from an amenity perspective. Other – there are a few instances of RPA encroachment from various development elements, such as level changes and hard surfacing. It is proposed that where these encroachments occur, arboricultural supervision will be provided. A supervision proposal will need to be submitted pre-commencement to cover this. Conditions: Development to accord with submitted arboricultural report SJA air 23221-01; final Arboricultural Method Statement to be approved.
Hampshire Countryside Service	Further information required. The applicant proposes four connection links onto Allbrook Footpath 716 for pedestrian movement to and from the site. A more detailed plan is required that confirms both the extent to which these links connect to FP716 and the overall design and materials used for these links. This is to ensure that the PROW is not illegally obstructed. An additional plan will be requested by condition. Informative recommended.
Urban Design Officer:	Further comments received January 2025 - No objection. The amendments and clarifications have overcome concerns previously raised. Original comments – further information required Summary: - Further opportunities for reducing hard surfacing should be sought, particularly at the northern end of the site; concern about hard paving around buildings 47-49; - Clarification needed on how external spaces will be used; - Brick walls should be reviewed within green corridor to increase active frontage; - Clarification required on materials – roof material and timber cladding;

	- Noted poor feedback from public consultation Green Corridor – It is welcomed that Plot 15 has openings at first and ground floor level, however there is a significant amount of side brick walls facing the open space, which will not contribute much towards an active frontage. Other solutions such as brickwalls with railings would be considered, or architectural detailing. The relocation of the visitor space in the green corridor is welcomed. External appearance and materials – It is unclear from the drawings what type of roof material is being proposed (natural or man-made). Plain clay tiles and natural slate would be recommended as they weather naturally and are in keeping materials such as clay bricks. The use of timber cladding seems random. The use of timber cladding for larger areas of buildings would seem more appropriate. Query whether timber cladding is compliant with Building Regulations.
Southern Water:	Southern Water will require a formal application for connection to the public sewer. Informative recommended.
Southampton Airport	No objection. Queries initially raised in relation to the water bodies and their attractiveness to birds, but the queries have been addressed through submission of further information.
Environmental Health – Noise	No objection. The Noise report identifies the major noise sources as the transportation to Allbrook Way and demonstrates that with the site design coupled with mitigation of the acoustic glazing ventilation strategy for the differing facades, the internal noise levels complying with BS 8233 can be met, although with windows closed on the dwellings in Zone A and B, which are situated on the boundary with the road. The noise levels to the private amenity space can be met with a 1.8m specified acoustic barriers enclosing all gardens. In summary, mitigation of transportation noise levels for the dwellings closest to the road are at an acceptable level.
Hampshire Archaeologist:	No objection. Archaeological conditions on the outline application will require discharge. An archaeological survey (evaluation) has been carried out and the results indicate that archaeological remains exist within the site which merit archaeological excavation prior to development (Condition 17). The applicant has submitted a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which is acceptable. The archaeological field work as set out in the WSI should be completed prior to development impacts, and reporting and publication of the results to follow in due course.
EBC Ecologist:	Comments received January 2025 – most points resolved, outstanding drainage point to be addressed by condition. The proposed ecological enhancements need to be shown on a biodiversity enhancement plan. The plan must be integrated with a lighting plan to demonstrate that bat and bird boxes and any habitat used by bats will not be illuminated above 1 lux. This can be secured by condition. <i>Officer note – mostly covered under Conditions 14 and 28 of the outline permission.</i> <i>The ecological enhancements for the site shall accord with the recommendations set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment Revision 3 (Ecosa, December 2024), with further detail provided in accordance with the requirements of Condition 14 of the outline planning permission ref. O/19/86980.</i>

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the locality and to ensure the protection of wildlife and supporting habitat found on the site and to secure opportunities for the improvement of wildlife corridors and wider enhancement of the nature conservation value of the site.

Reptile management and enhancement information is appropriate. A reptile management plan can be conditioned, to show the location of the receptor site and hibernacula. Translocation data must be provided to the LPA at the end of the translocation exercise and destructive search, before start of construction.

No development shall be carried out until a Reptile Management Plan, to include the location of the receptor site and hibernacula and translocation data, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that reptiles are not harmed by the development, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Great crested newt proposals with mitigation under ESPM licence in tandem with reptile mitigation and enhancement is appropriate. Licence method needs to be submitted to the LPA. Habitat management plan to be conditioned together with reptile management plan. This needs to show the location of the receptor site and hibernacula, with translocation data provided to the LPA (as per reptile requirements).

No development shall start on site until a great crested newt licence method statement and a habitat management plan, to include the location of the receptor site and hibernacula and translocation data, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that great crested newts are not harmed by the development, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

A precautionary working method for hedgehogs and small animals is required. Hedgehog gaps in fences and the location of two hedgehog domes proposed as enhancements must be shown on a plan, as per the recommendations of the updated Ecological Impact Assessment.

Planting specifications should include night scented flowering plants, and plants that flower over a long season.

Drainage – There is a surface water drainage pipe running along the road to the east of the pond system with several gullies and two catchpits, which only goes through one form of treatment rather than three before being discharged off site. This needs updating.

Long term funded maintenance and monitoring plan for the SuDS wetland and other wetland is required.

Comments received October 2024 - Further information / clarifications required.

Layout / green infrastructure:

Green infrastructure is not consistently present around the edges of the site. Discontinuous hedgerows or areas of scrub do not provide continuous cover for animals using or commuting across the site. Green infrastructure should be continuous with gaps only for access. The long distance viewing corridors shown on page 16 can be maintained, but even a low level of planted scrub or a short hedgerow should connect the proposed plantings along the eastern site boundary. The central green corridor must include more varied planting with different levels, structure and cover.

Surface water drainage:

- The system appears to be a pipe to tank to pond system. The use of swales and rain gardens would be preferable along the road and path edges before water reaches the attenuation tank, SuDS ponds and wetland area.
- Arrows showing the direction of surface water drainage and exceedance flows required on drainage plan. Each house should have a water butt.
- Gullies should be avoided but if necessary, they must have amphibian escape ramps.
- The recommendation in the Drainage Management and Maintenance schedule of mowing margins of the wetland flow channels, maintaining low vegetation height, removing silt, cutting / weed removal and inspection, all have the potential to affect great crested newts and other wildlife. A precautionary working method and ecological supervision will be required, along with checking of amphibian escape ramps. Note: *Drainage maintenance details are secured under condition 10 of the outline permission.*
- Query brown dotted line shown along the top edge of the northernmost pond.

Ecology:

- The line of bramble scrub along the eastern site boundary shown in the EIA (Figure 5) should be retained and enhanced.
- The site is suitable for badgers, bats, breeding birds, hedgehogs, common toads, terrestrial great crested newts and reptiles. Low populations of slow worms and grass snakes have been recorded on site. Newts have also been recorded as present in Pond 7, 75m to the west of the site.
- The recommended mitigations and enhancements for these species are appropriate, but the quantities of bat and bird boxes must be increased.
- Planting specifications should include night scented flowering plants to ensure sufficient supply of insects for bats. A wide variety of flowering plants is also needed to attract insects for swifts.
- A European Protected Species Mitigation licence for great crested newts will be required, which can only be applied for after planning permission is granted.
- Hedgehog holes are required in the baseboards of any suitable closed board fencing where there are no level differences between gardens.

	• A more specific BMEP is required before start of works, to show the location of all biodiversity mitigations and enhancements (could be conditioned). • Wildlife sensitive lighting scheme required .Covered by condition 28 on outline scheme. • CEMP required. Note condition 6 on outline. • Archaeological excavation must be coordinated with ecological mitigation for great crested newts and reptiles.				
Eastleigh Ramblers:	Further comments on additional information, December 2024: The submitted 'Statement of clarify' in relation to the right of way is noted, which confirms that the development will not directly affect the right of way. Concerned that the S106 Agreement on the outline permission does not make provision for improvements to the surface of the footpath. Request that some contributions are used towards this. Original comments - Further information required. Application plans need to be reviewed to confirm if the designated right of way is to be diverted or retained and cleared on the alignment shown on the Definitive Map (Footpath 716 Allbrook). Recommend surface improvements of Footpath 716. Pedestrian network does not address desire lines towards Otterbourne and there needs to be a link to Footpath 716 at the northern end of the site otherwise residents will create their own route.				
Housing Officer:	Further comments received January 24 – No objection. Wheelchair unit plans agreed. Further comments received December 24 - No objection subject to clarification regarding the wheelchair unit layout It was previously requested that the applicant review the affordable housing proposals and a number of suggestions were made. The applicants have now advised that they have considered the suggestions but having regard to viability constraints, they are unable to amend the affordable housing mix. The following mix is therefore accepted: <table border="0"> <tr> <td>A/Rent</td> <td>2No 1 beds / 5No 2 beds / 4No 3 beds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SO</td> <td>1No 1 bed / 3No 2 beds / 2No 3 beds.</td> </tr> </table> Query still remains in relation to the layout of the wheelchair accessible unit – Plot 47. Original comments: further information required 17 units of affordable housing are required (35%). This should be split 65/35% between rented and shared ownership respectively, equating to 11 rented homes and 6 shared ownership. The affordable housing mix should be broadly reflective of the total housing being provided on site. Since outline application stage, there has been a reduction in overall numbers and therefore a reduction in affordable provision by 1 house, but the proposed mix has also changed and is now more weighted towards 1 and 2 bedroom	A/Rent	2No 1 beds / 5No 2 beds / 4No 3 beds	SO	1No 1 bed / 3No 2 beds / 2No 3 beds.
A/Rent	2No 1 beds / 5No 2 beds / 4No 3 beds				
SO	1No 1 bed / 3No 2 beds / 2No 3 beds.				

	provision, with a reduction in 3-bedroom homes and no 4-bedroom homes. The Council would request a maximum of two 1-bedroom affordable homes and would ask for at least one 4-bedroom home for rent. Query raised about the accessibility standards being met for the dwellings, and if any would be suitable for wheelchairs.
Nature Space:	Advice provided. Agree with the recommendations of the ecological report that a European Protected Species Mitigation licence is required in respect of great crested newts. The development falls within the red impact risk zone for great crested newts, indicating a high likelihood of newt presence. There are 6 ponds within 500m of the development with the closet located 65m, 70m and 75m to the west. There is 1 recent great crested newt record within 250m. There are no water bodies on the site and therefore no breeding opportunities for great crested newts on site. The woodland habitats provide excellent sheltering and foraging opportunities and the site is well connected to known breeding ponds via the adjacent woodland. The site is therefore assessed as having suitability to support great crested newt. The nearby ponds have been surveyed and a Great Crested Newt eDNA survey produced positive results for the presence of great crested newt within Pond 7. Due to the loss of great crested newt terrestrial habitat at the site, a licence is required before development works commence. The applicant has two options – either the European Protected Species Licence route, or the District Licencing route. If the District Licencing route is used, a NatureSpace Report or Certificate needs to be submitted prior to determination of the application.
Hampshire Swifts	Concerns raised: The swift nest box proposals do not meet best practice guidance as regards integral nest bricks. The development should contain at least 1 swift brick per home. These are preferable to external bat boxes as they are a permanent feature with zero maintenance requirements, better thermal regulation and better aesthetic integration.
Landscape Officer:	Comments received January 2025 – some points addressed on updated plans. Other matters remain outstanding but can be dealt with by detailed condition. Original comments: Further information required. Drainage: Need to ensure no conflicts with tree positions. Levels layout: Further details of retaining walls required. Surface finishes: • Request indication of colour by surface type; • Clarify acronyms used on the legend for kerbs; • Query edging detail for Hoggin path; • Parking bays should not use white lines to delineate spaces; • Visitor bays and BCPs to be Golpa gravel surfacing for 'softer' effect adjacent to open space;

	• Query if a mown grass path to the LAP is appropriate. Consider alternative surfacing. Boundary treatments: • Clarification needed on existing boundary treatments; • Are gaps to be provided in post and rail fencing to access POS? • Consider wider use of 1m high metal railings in conjunction with hedging to define front garden defensible space; • Suggest extending railing S around Plot 23; • Hedgehog gaps needed in closed board fencing gravel boards; • Will fencing be required around the LAP? Landscaping: • Tree planting to soften views from the PROW and to bolster vegetative cover within the open spaces is important. Currently limited tree planting in the open spaces – this should be increased. • Query white areas on plans; • Existing understorey vegetation should be accurately shown; • Suggest further clipped hedges in places; • Step out strips required alongside parking bays; • Boundary walls should be softened with climbers; • Specific advice provided about planting around certain plots (see full comments); • Advice provided on planting species, soil depth requirements and maintenance; • Advice provided about bench positions; • Further details of timber boardwalk required. Planting schedule: • Advice provided about tree and hedge species. • All detailed species required. Other points: • Details of LAP will be required; • LEMP will be required.
Highway Authority:	Comments dated 3 February 2025 – No objection Tracking plans have been provided, which demonstrate suitable provision for refuse vehicle movements. Comments dated 28 January 2025 – tracking plans required The amended and additional information provided by the applicants has addressed the majority of matters previously raised. However, tracking plans are still required for refuse vehicles and cars at the pinch point and on bends in the roads. Recommend that pergola details are requested by condition. Comments dated 11 November 2024 – further information required The reserved matters application covers the internal layout. The site access junction was previously agreed as part of the outline

application O/19/86980 and is currently progressing through the S278 process.

It is understood that the roads and footways are not being offered for adoption. HCC would therefore not object in principle to the proposals, but would advise the developer to ensure that roads and footways are designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice, and that an appropriate Private Management Plan is put in place to deal with any future issues.

The following comments are provided in relation to the internal layout:

- The access road comes into close proximity to the highway bank between the site and Allbrook Way. Any works that either require, or have an impact on the bank will need to be undertaken via S278 agreement with HCC.
- The proposed priority build out near the boundary with Westfield House is acceptable with adequate forward visibility, and it is welcomed that priority would be given for vehicles heading south west (exit route), as this will keep driveways clear of potential queues.
- Refuse tracking drawings are required for the build out section.
- Combined car and refuse vehicle tracking should be provided for the whole site.
- The submitted tracking plans show some areas of the site where refuse vehicles would overhang private boundaries (i.e. plots 24 and 38), and vehicle movements could be further affected by landscaping. The visitor parking opposite Plot 47 could also affect refuse vehicle movement.
- Visibility splays around the site are generally acceptable. However, there are areas of the site (e.g. outside plots 27 and 28), where the splays cross private land, which would not confirm to HCC guidance for adoption. As an unadopted road, covenants or similar would need to be placed on such areas of land stipulating that nothing over 0.6m in height can be placed on it accordingly. Other areas of the site that suffer similar issues are Plots 10 and 47, however due to the anticipated speeds at these locations, this would not be a significant concern.
- Recommended that a Site Management Plan is put in place, to manage the site in terms of parking and landscaping restrictions.
- Pedestrian movement around the site appears generally acceptable with links out to the adjacent Public Right of Way. All dwellings also have rear access which is welcomed. There will be additional requirements for street lighting, dropped kerbs, tactile paving etc, which could be conditioned.
- The vehicle parking layout is mainly acceptable, with adequate sized bays and turning aisle widths. One area of concern is the pergolas for Plots 43 to 46, as the vertical supports would need to be designed so as not to block the opening of car doors. The number of parking spaces should be accessed by EBC, but it is noted that Plots 4, 5 and 47 only appear to have 1 vehicle space per dwelling.
- Cycle parking is acceptable, with sheds being provided for those dwellings without garages.

Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC):	Final comments, 4 February 2025 – No objection Updated drainage plans have been reviewed, along with a response from the applicants Drainage Engineer to the previous queries raised. The drainage strategy for the site was set out in the Flood Risk and Assessment and Drainage Strategy approved at outline application stage. The undeveloped green areas such as gardens and open spaces will continue to discharge at existing greenfield rate, and will largely be drained by the proposed drainage network. This means there is likely to be higher than modelled water levels in the proposed drainage network and attenuation features, and it is noted that the attenuation basin has been designed with additional capacity to mitigate this effect to some extent, although some storm events may result in water overtopping the attenuation basin into the treatment basins. However, it is considered that the development would not result in a significantly increased discharge from the site given the proposed basins and therefore will not cause an increase in flood risk downstream of the site. It is noted that Southern Water has accepted the connection and discharge rate into the surface water sewer. Further comments, Jan 25 – further information required Following review of the amended and additional information, queries still remain. Matters relating to the following need to be addressed: • Runoff rates – the runoff from undeveloped areas of the site have not been considered in the drainage strategy, which is significantly different to the strategy proposed at outline stage. • Tank levels - An error in the tank levels upstream of 43CP does not appear to have been addressed. • Discharge connection - LLFA requests confirmation of connection approval to demonstrate the proposed discharge point and to confirm that the drainage scheme is feasible. • Exceedance flows – There is a discrepancy between the exceedance flow plan and the levels plan. Original comments - Further information required. The change in drainage strategy following site investigations that revealed poor soil infiltration rates is noted. Further information required: • For the latest drainage model, an assessment of runoff from areas not included in the model is required, to include gardens and other green areas. If deemed necessary, these areas should be included in the model then they should be excluded from the greenfield runoff calculation. • The offline attenuation tanks shown on the drainage layout plan are shown at a lower level than the carrier drain. After a significant storm event they will not be able to drain fully back into the network. This could present an increased risk of flooding. • Consideration should be given to access to the attenuation tanks for inspection and maintenance, and venting of the tanks to allow escape of air while the tanks are filled with water. • Confirmation of agreement with Southern Water is required.
--	---

	• Confirmation of the location and invert level of the existing public surface water sewer in Knowle Hill is required. • The LLFA would expect all ordinary watercourses to be maintained and protected during works. If any works would affect existing ordinary watercourse then consent is required separate to the planning permission. • Location of the downstream defender treatment device is not clear on the drainage drawings. Data sheets required. • Review of the Drainage Management and Maintenance Schedule is required to consider regular maintenance of storage structures, removal of silt and blockages. • Results of 1 in 1 and 1 in 30 + climate change rainfall events required. • Allowance for private driveways and garages required. • Inconsistencies between the exceedance flow route plan and proposed levels plan in the northern section of the site.
Natural England:	Comments received 4 February 2025 – No objection. The submitted Appropriate Assessment and response document from Gillings Planning have addressed previous concerns. No objection is raised subject to the required mitigation being secured by condition. Note that an Appropriate Assessment would be required at conditions discharge stage in relation to phosphorous mitigation. Comments dated 18 December 2024 – further information required A revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Appropriate Assessment is required to assess the impacts on designated sites. Further information requested in relation to sediment impacts and management and maintenance of the drainage system.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Site visit carried out at the reserved matters pre-application stage, 25 October 2023 and 16 April 2024. Photographs on file.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u>: The most relevant policies are: AL2 (Land West of Allbrook Way); S1 (Sustainable development); S2 (Approach to new development); S3 (Location of new housing); S10 (Green infrastructure); DM1 (General criteria); DM2 (Environmentally sustainable development); DM3 (Adaptation to climate change); DM6 (Sustainable surface water management); DM8 (Pollution); DM11 (Nature conservation); DM13 (Transport); DM14 (Parking); DM24 (Housing mix); DM29 (Access standards); DM30 (Internal space standards); DM33 (Open space); and DM38 (Funding infrastructure). Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Planning Obligations; Affordable Housing.

Assessment:

Site and surroundings

The application site lies to the west of the A335 (Allbrook Way), with access via Knowle Hill. The site extends northwards from Knowle Hill and is separated into two parts by an existing dwelling (Westfield House), with the southern and northern sides of the site linked by a narrow strip of land to the east of Westfield House. There is an area of woodland on the west side of the site, which links to an adjacent Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, and mature trees around some of the site boundaries. There is a public right of way which runs through the woodland (footpath Allbrook 716). To the south-west of the site is residential development in Knowle Hill and Allbrook Knoll.

Principle of the proposal

The site is allocated in the Local Plan (Policy AL2) and the principle of a residential development of up to 52 dwellings has been established by the outline planning permission ref. O/19/86980. This granted detailed permission for the access only, with details of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping to be dealt with as reserved matters. This application seeks approval of all reserved matters for a development of 49 dwellings. Whilst the number of dwellings has reduced by 3 dwellings, it remains in accordance with the outline permission which allowed for up to 52 dwellings.

Housing mix and affordable housing

The development would comprise a range of dwelling sizes from 1-bedroom to 4-bedroom, with the majority being 2 or 3 bed. This accords with the recognised need set out in Policy DM24 of the Local Plan, where it states that due to an aging population and falling household sizes, there is a need for more two and three bed dwellings in the Borough. The total amount of dwellings of each size is as follows:

- 3 x 1-bed
- 19 x 2-bed
- 21 x 3-bed
- 6 x 4-bed

In relation to affordable housing, in accordance with Policy DM28 of the Local Plan, the S106 Agreement attached to the outline permission requires the provision of 35% affordable housing, with 65% being affordable rent and 35% being for shared ownership. For the scheme of 49 dwellings, this amounts to a requirement for 17 affordable dwellings, with 11 for rent and 6 for shared ownership. The proposed affordable housing provision is as follows:

- Affordable rent – 11 dwellings comprising 2 x 1-bed, 5 x 2-bed and 4 x 3-bed
- Shared ownership – 6 dwellings comprising 1 x 1-bed, 3 x 2-bed and 2 x 3-bed

During the course of the application, the Council's Housing Officer made suggestions for some amendments to the housing mix to better reflect the Borough's identified need. However, the applicant provided further information to justify the provision put forward and ultimately this has been agreed, and accords with the S106 requirements.

Reserved matter – Layout

Roads and footways

The internal road layout is broadly in line with the access parameter plan approved at outline application stage. The applicant has confirmed that the roads will not be offered for adoption by Hampshire County Council, however, the Highway Authority has reviewed the plans and offered advice in relation to various matters including visibility splays and vehicle tracking. Tracking plans for the site, including for refuse vehicles, were requested to ensure that the layout worked appropriately for all vehicles. These have now been provided and are confirmed as acceptable to demonstrate that there would be adequate space for refuse vehicles and cars to manoeuvre around the site without causing

obstructions. Based on the updated and additional plans, the internal road layout is considered acceptable.

The plans also include three pedestrian links to the existing right of way that runs through the woodland on the western side of the site. This accords with the links indicatively shown on the outline parameter plans and updated surface finishes plans have been provided to confirm that these would be surfaced with hoggin gravel. Hoggin gravel would also be used for the footpaths around the drainage features, with a short section of boardwalk, and this type of surfacing is considered appropriate for the landscaped parts of the site. The Council's Landscape Officer has requested some further details including colour and edging details for the hoggin paths and samples of the boardwalk material, and this can be requested by condition.

The County Countryside Service has requested an additional plan to clearly show the interconnection between the new footpath links and the existing right of way, and this can be secured by condition.

Overall, the road and footpath layout of the site is considered acceptable and in line with the principles agreed at outline application stage.

Parking layout

The parking provision for the site would comprise a combination of on-plot parking, parking courts and frontage parking bays. Visitor parking would be accommodated by parking bays along the internal roads. In total, 131 parking spaces would be provided, comprising the following:

- 97 x allocated spaces
- 6 x car ports
- 18 x garages
- 10 x visitor spaces

The Council's Adopted Parking Standards requires the following provision:

- 1-bed dwellings – 2 spaces
- 2 and 3-bed dwellings – 2 spaces
- 4+ bed dwellings – 3 spaces
- Visitor spaces – 0.2 per dwelling

The proposed accommodation would comprise 43 x 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings requiring 2 spaces each, and 6 x 4-bed dwellings requiring 3 spaces. This would amount to a requirement for 104 parking spaces, plus a further 10 spaces to be formally marked out for visitors (0.2 x 49), totalling 114 spaces.

As noted above, the scheme would provide a total of 131 spaces, which exceeds the total requirement. This is mainly because some of the larger dwellings would have garages in addition to the required number of spaces. It is noted that the 1-bedroom dwellings have only been allocated 1 space each, which is below the Adopted Standard. However, it is acknowledged that the Council's emerging updated Parking Standards would reduce the parking requirement for 1-bedroom dwellings down to 1 space, on the basis that dwellings of this size tend to result in less parking demand. Having regard to this, and the small number of 1-bedroom dwellings on the site (3 properties), the reduced provision for these properties is not considered to be a significant concern.

In relation to visitor spaces, 10 designated visitor bays are marked out on the plan and informal visitor parking could take place along the internal roads, which are shown to be at least 5.5m in width in line with guidance set out in the Adopted Parking Standards.

Cycle storage is shown to be provided either within garages or in separate cycle stores in the gardens of the properties, as indicated on the submitted Parking Strategy Plan. A

condition can be imposed on this reserved matters permission for full details of the cycle stores to be submitted prior to occupation of the dwellings.

Residential amenity

- Neighbouring amenity:

The only neighbouring residential property that would be directly impacted by the proposed development would be Westfield House, which the application site extends around.

The closest dwelling to Westfield House would be Plot 9. This property would be located on the same building line as Westfield House but at a higher land level, with a distance of 12.5m between the side elevations of the two properties (with a garage in between). In terms of height, section plans indicate that the ground level of Plot 9 would be approximately 1.5m higher than that of Westfield House, with the ridge height being approximately 2.5m higher. The occupants of Westfield House have raised concerns about an overbearing impact from this adjacent property and loss of privacy. However, it is considered that with the separation between the two buildings and the siting on the same building line, the new dwelling would not appear unacceptably overbearing when viewed from Westfield House. There would also be no windows facing south-east on Plot 9, therefore no direct overlooking to the side windows of Westfield House. Whilst there would be an element of overlooking from the rear windows of Plot 9 to the garden of Westfield House, this type of overlooking is characteristic of residential areas and is not considered harmful. The siting and orientation of Plot 9 to the north-west of Westfield House would also ensure no adverse loss of light to the neighbouring residents.

Plots 7 and 8 would also result in a level of overlooking to the rear part of the garden of Westfield House, with a distance of around 10m from the rear elevation of Plot 8 and the Westfield House garden boundary. However, given the length of the garden of Westfield House and the distance between the rear windows of these plots and the rear windows of Westfield House (around 34m), it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable impact on the privacy of the neighbouring residents.

The other proposed dwellings are considered to be sufficient distanced or orientated appropriately to prevent adverse impacts on the amenities of Westfield House.

Neighbouring properties on Knowle Hill would be sufficiently distanced from the new dwellings to prevent any adverse impacts on light, outlook or privacy.

- Relationship between new dwellings:

The Council's Quality Places SPD states that new build residential dwellings should have at least 20m distance back to back to protect the privacy of future occupants. A standard back to back relationship would be created between Plots 39-42 and Plots 43-46, and between Plots 31-32 and Plots 29-30. All of these dwellings would have at least 20m between them in line with the SPD guidance and the section plans demonstrate that the levels difference between these properties would not be significant. The other proposed dwellings are considered to have appropriate separation distances and garden lengths to ensure suitable levels of privacy, light and outlook for future occupants.

Garden sizes:

All of the new dwellings on the site would have private gardens. In accordance with the Council's Quality Places SPD, garden sizes are required to be at least 60% of the floorspace of the dwelling. This appears to have been met for the majority of the proposed dwellings, with the exception of three of the smallest dwellings, Plots 4, 5 and 15. Plots 4 and 5 are maisonettes and would require gardens of 37m² to accord with the SPD guidance. These gardens are between 30 and 33m² therefore fall slightly short of the guidance. Plot 15's garden also falls short, being around 35m² compared to the 60%

requirement of 44m². However, given the small size of these units and the close proximity to open spaces on the site, it is not considered that an objection could be sustained on this basis.

Many of the other plots have gardens exceeding the size guidance, e.g.

- Plot 1 – dwelling size 137m², garden size 225m² (164%)
- Plot 6 – dwelling size 94m², garden size 67.6m² (72%)
- Plot 27 – dwelling size 81m², garden size 59m² (73%)
- Plot 30 – dwelling size 106.5m², garden size 72.59m² (68%)
- Plot 44 – dwelling size 84.1, garden size 55.63m² (64%)
- Plot 47 – dwelling size 69.9m², garden size 63.73m² (91%)
- Plot 49 – dwelling size 69.9m², garden size 83.23m² (119%)

Dwelling sizes - floorspace:

Policy DM30 of the Local Plan requires new dwellings to meet, as a minimum, the Nationally Described Space Standards.

Each house type plan includes a table setting out the floor area of the property to show compliance with the Nationally Described Space Standards. Many of the properties exceed the minimum space standards comfortably, e.g.:

- House Type Grouse (Plot 1) – 4b 6p – 137m² (required 106m²)
- House Type Robin (Plot 4-5) – 1b 2p – 62.8m² (required 50m²)
- House Type Heron (Plot 10) – 3b 5p – 106.5m² (required 97m²)
- House Type Blackbird (Plots 20-22; 27-28) – 2b 3p – 81.1m² (required 70m²)
- House Type Heron (Plot 24) – 3b 5p – 106m² (required 93m²)
- House Type Buzzard (Plots 41-42) – 3b 4p – 107m² (required 84m²)
- House Type Jay (Plot 47) – 1b 2p – 69.9m² (required 50m²)

Bedroom sizes and storage also appear to have been designed to meet the standards.

Accessibility standards

Policy DM29 of the Local Plan requires at least 80% of dwellings on all housing sites to meet Part M4(2) of the building regulations (for accessible and adaptable dwellings). In addition, the policy states that for major schemes of over 40 units, at least 2 market dwellings should meet Part M4(3)(2)(a) (wheelchair adaptable dwellings), and at least 1 affordable dwelling should meet part M4(3)(2)(b) (wheelchair accessible).

The outline planning permission did not secure the accessibility standards by condition and there is no specific clause within the S106 agreement to secure a wheelchair accessible affordable unit. However, the submitted Planning Statement confirms that all dwellings on the site have been designed to meet M4(2) standard, and that they also meet the criteria for M4(3). One of the affordable dwellings (Plot 47) is also proposed to be wheelchair accessible to accord with the specific requirements of Policy DM29, and updated plans of this property have been provided to demonstrate that it would meet the required standards.

Drainage layout:

The application is supported by detailed drainage plans and information, which have been prepared in line with the principles agreed through the Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy agreed at outline application stage. The drainage strategy would comprise a combination of permeable paving, trapped gullies, silt catchpits and a three-stage wetland to provide water quality mitigation. Much of the southern side of the site would be taken up by the wetland areas, which would also incorporate pedestrian walkways and landscaping.

The drainage strategy has been reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and whilst it is determined that the water levels in the proposed drainage network are likely to

be higher than previously modelled, it has been confirmed that the attenuation basin has been designed with additional capacity. The LLFA has commented that any overtopping of the attenuation basin (e.g. during storm events) would go into the treatment basins and would not cause an increase in flood risk downstream of the site. It is also noted that Southern Water has accepted the connection and discharge rate into their surface water sewer. The LLFA has therefore raised no objection to the proposed drainage strategy.

A concern has, however, been raised by the Council's Ecologist as one of the drainage pipes running to the east of the pond system does not appear to have sufficient filtration before being discharged into the system. The applicant is in the process of reviewing this issue and it has been agreed that final updates to the drainage strategy can be secured by condition to address this point.

The applicant has confirmed that the drainage system would be maintained and monitored over the lifetime of the development. This would be the responsibility of Bargate Homes until occupation of the final home, after which responsibility would be passed to a Managing Agent appointed by the Management Company (residents of the development). Full details of the measures for the long term management and maintenance of the drainage system would need to be submitted prior to occupation of the development, in accordance with the requirements of Condition 10 of the outline planning permission.

Play area

The provision of a Local Area of Play (LAP) is required in accordance with the S106 Agreement associated with the outline planning permission. The area for the LAP is shown on the southern side of the site, south of Plot 1, but full details of the equipment and layout of this space has not yet been provided. Whilst ideally this play area would be overlooked by more than one house, the provision of the play area on the south side of the site has benefits in terms of being accessible to both the new residents and residents of existing housing to the west. The drainage requirements for the site also limit options for alternative positions for the play area, and on balance its proposed location is considered acceptable. There would be a distance of around 14m between the front elevation of Plot 1 and the play area, which is considered to be an acceptable distance to protect the amenity of the occupants of that dwelling (given the small scale nature of the play area). The full details of layout and equipment would be required prior to commencement of the development to comply with the S106 Agreement.

Reserved matter – Scale

The development would comprise predominantly two-storey dwellings, with three bungalows proposed for the north side of the site. This scale of development accords with the parameter plans approved at outline application stage and is considered acceptable for the location, which is characterised predominantly by 2-storey dwellings.

Reserved matter – Appearance

The reserved matters application is accompanied by detailed house type plans and elevations, streetscene drawings and details of materials for the housing and surface treatments. A detailed material schedule has also been provided.

The housing would be predominantly two-storey in height and would comprise a mix of detached properties, semi-detached and short terraces. The dwellings would be of a traditional design with pitched roofs and materials comprising predominantly red brick but with variations in the form of cream painted brickwork, Cedral cladding (in either grey brown or sage green) and variations in roof tile colour. The majority of the dwellings would have white UPVC windows but a limited number are proposed to have green coloured windows to add further variation (Plot 8, 20-21, 38 and 39). The traditional style of the dwellings is considered appropriate in the context of the edge of settlement location and the traditional form of nearby dwellings. The proposed material palette is also considered acceptable and the applicants have confirmed that roof tiles would be natural

clay or natural slate in accordance with recommendations from the Council's Urban Design Officer. The details of materials submitted with this application is considered acceptable to comply with the requirement of Condition 5 of the outline planning permission, and this condition also secures the implementation of the development in accordance with the approved details.

The perimeter block layout of the site allows for active frontages to roads and open spaces. Where properties are positioned side on to roads or the green corridor, e.g. Plots 14, 23 and 24, side windows have been incorporated to prevent blank elevations facing these spaces, and this is supported by the Urban Design Officer.

Some concerns have been raised by the Council's Urban Design and Landscape Officers about the extent of hard surfacing on the site, especially where there are relatively large parking courts such as on the northern side of the site. The applicants have sought to soften the visual impact of the hard surfacing with variations in materials, and additional planting where possible. For the roads, the materials would comprise a combination of tarmac and block paving, with Golpa gravel used for drive areas adjacent to open spaces. Parking courts and bays would also be block paved. For the large parking court to the north of Plots 43-46, it has not been possible to incorporate tree planting in the space available and pergolas are proposed instead to break up the starkness of this area. Although pergolas are not seen as the most successful solution for softening the visual impact of parking areas, this particular parking court is in a non-prominent location and it is not considered that its appearance would harm the overall visual appearance and character of the development.

Reserved matter – Landscaping, including trees

Detailed landscaping plans have been submitted and these have been revised throughout the course of the application process in line with comments made by the Council's Landscape Consultant.

A key feature of the landscape scheme is the provision of a green corridor through the centre of the site, in line with the Landscape Parameter Plan agreed at outline application stage. This would comprise a pedestrian, tree lined route running from east to west and would connect with the adjacent woodland on the west side of the site. The pedestrian path, along with the woodland connection points and the paths through the wetland area, would be surfaced with hoggin gravel, to provide a less formal appearance to these routes. The Council's Landscape Consultant has requested further details of this surfacing material to ensure that it is suitable in terms of colour and finish, and this can be requested by condition. The Council's Urban Design Officer raised some concerns with the extent of blank brickwork to the walls facing this green corridor and the applicants have updated the plans to show climbers on the largest section of wall to soften its appearance.

The majority of existing trees around the boundaries of the site would be retained and the proposals also include new tree planting throughout the site. The Council's Tree Officer has raised no objection to the scheme, noting that whilst some trees would be removed, this would be satisfactorily compensated by the proposed new tree planting, and that pruning proposals for some of the existing trees is suitably justified. The Tree Officer has, however, noted that there are some areas where development works would encroach on the RPA's of retained trees and for these areas, arboricultural supervision would be required, which can be secured by condition. A condition is also required to ensure adherence to the updated Arboricultural Report and tree protection measures.

The overall landscape proposals as shown on the submitted plans have largely been agreed, but there remain some points for which further information is required. This includes further details of surfacing materials, front garden boundaries, tree pit details and details of the boardwalk. Some further tree planting within the open spaces has also been requested by the Council's Landscape Consultant. These final detailed points can be secured by condition, to ensure that a high standard of landscaping is achieved.

Other matters

Ecology

The application is supported by an updated Ecological Impact Assessment, which has been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist, along with the Landscape Proposals. The Council's Ecologist initially raised concerns and queries about a number of matters including green infrastructure, planting proposals, drainage, and provision of bat and bird boxes. Updated landscape plans have since been provided to address the matters relating to green infrastructure and planting, and these are considered acceptable.

In relation to bat and bird boxes, it is noted that Hampshire Swifts also requested the provision of additional swift bricks, at least one per dwelling. In response, the applicants have submitted an updated Ecological Impact Assessment which sets out updated recommendations, including for each dwelling to have a biodiversity enhancement, with either a bat brick, bird box or bee brick. The Council's Ecologist is now happy with the biodiversity enhancement proposals, subject to some further details being secured by condition, including locations of the enhancements and lighting. This is mostly covered by the conditions already imposed on the outline permission (e.g. Conditions 14 for a LEMP and 28 for lighting details). However, some additional conditions are required to secure adherence to the latest agreed details (as set out in the updated Ecological Impact Assessment), and to secure specific requirements relating to reptiles and great crested newts.

Noise

An updated Noise Assessment has been submitted with the application in line with the requirements of Condition 32 of the outline planning permission.

The mitigation measures set out in the new Noise Assessment include the provision of acoustic glazing and a ventilation scheme for dwellings closest to the road noise. During the outline planning application there had been discussions about the potential need for an acoustic barrier along the eastern side of the site, but this is no longer considered necessary. The Noise Assessment and mitigation recommendations have been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer and confirmed to be acceptable to achieve acceptable noise limits within the dwellings. A Condition can be imposed on the reserved matters to ensure adherence to the approved scheme.

Impact on European Protected Sites

The potential impacts of the development on European protected sites was assessed through the outline planning application, and included impacts in relation to nutrient loading and impacts from sediment pollution to the River Itchen. Mitigation of these impacts is secured through conditions on the outline permission, which includes conditions for a Construction Environmental Management Plan (Condition 6), Drainage scheme provision and maintenance (Conditions 9 and 10), nutrient mitigation (Condition 33), and Sediment Impact Assessment and mitigation (Condition 34).

This reserved matters application is for a lesser number of dwellings than assessed at outline stage, and further details have also now been provided in relation to drainage and sediment mitigation. An updated Appropriate Assessment was therefore prepared and submitted to Natural England, who has confirmed no objection.

Other matters raised in representations

A number of concerns have been raised in the representations about the impact of developing housing on the site in terms of loss of green space, impacts on wildlife and increased traffic. These matters were all considered in details through the outline

planning application, and the granting of outline permission has secured the principle of housing development on the site.

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. The proposed development would incorporate various measures to minimise pollution, protect water quality, increase water efficiency and enhance biodiversity, all of which contribute towards climate change policy objectives.

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 ☐
-----------------	---	--

Conditions:

Approved plans

The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the following plans numbered:

- P23-0088_DE_004_E_10 – Proposed Layout (Composite version)
- P23-0088_DE_004_E_01 – Proposed Layout

- P23-0088_DE_002_C_10.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Grouse Plot 1
- P23-0088_DE_002_D_11.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Kiwi/Robin Plots 2-5
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_12.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Sparrow Plots 6-7
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_05 – elevations and floor plans House Type Finch Plot 8
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_10.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Grouse Plot 9
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_06.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Heron Plot 10
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_09.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Quail Plot 11, 12
- P23-0088_DE_002_D_07.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Nightingale Plot 13
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_07.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Nightingale Plot 14
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_14 – elevations and floor plans House Type Pigeon Plot 15
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_02.3 – elevations and floor plans House Type Blackbird/Kiwi Plots 16-18
- P23-0088_DE_002_A_04.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Crow Plot 19
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_02.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Blackbird Plots 20-22
- P23-0088_DE_002_D_04.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Crow Plot 23
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_06.3 – elevations and floor plans House Type Heron Plot 24
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_12.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Sparrow Plots 25-26
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_02.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Blackbird Plots 27-28
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_06.4 - elevations and floor plans House Type Heron Plots 29-30
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_06.5 – elevations and floor plans House Type Heron Plots 31-32
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_09.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Quail Plot 33
- P23-0088_DE_002_B_08 – elevations and floor plans House Type Phoenix Plot 34
- P23-0088_DE_002_D_07.5 – elevations and floor plans House Type Wren Plot 35
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_06.2 – elevations and floor plans House Type Heron Plot 36
- P23-0088_DE_002_D_07.3 – elevations and floor plans House Type Nightingale Plot 37
- P23-0088_DE_002_D_07.4 – elevations and floor plans House Type Nightingale Plot 38
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_12.3 – elevations and floor plans House Type Sparrow Plots 39-40
- P23-0088_DE_002_B_03 – elevations and floor plans House Type Buzzard Plots 41-42
- P23-0088_DE_002_C_11.1 – elevations and floor plans House Type Kiwi Plots 43-44, 45-46
- P23-0088_DE_002_F_13 – elevations and floor plans House Type Jay Plot 47
- P23-0088_DE_002_D_01 – elevations and floor Plans House Type Lark Plots 48,49
- P23-0088_DE_004_C_03 – Affordable Tenure Plan

- P23-0088_DE_004_C_04 - Open Space Plan
- P23-0088_DE_004_C_07 – Building Heights Plan
- P23-0088_DE_004_C_08 – Boundary Treatments Plan
- P23-0088_DE_004_C_09 – Materials Plan
- P23-0088_DE_005_B_01 – Street Scenes
- P23-0088_DE_002_B_15 – Garages
- P23-0088_DE_004_C_06 – Parking Strategy
- P23-0088_DE_007_A_01 Illustrative Cross Section
- P23-0088_DE_007_B_02 – Illustrative Cross Section
- 201 G - Proposed Drainage Layout plan 1 of 3
- 202 G – Proposed Drainage Layout Plan Sheet 2 of 3
- 300 i – Proposed Surface Finishes Whole Site
- 301 E – Proposed Surface Finishes Sheet 1 of 3
- 302 E – Proposed Surface Finishes Sheet 2 of 3
- 303 E – Proposed Surface Finishes Sheet 3 of 3
- 400 H – Proposed Levels Layout Plan Whole Site
- 401 E – Proposed Levels Layout Plan Sheet 1 of 3
- 402 E – Proposed Levels Layout Plan Sheet 2 of 3
- 403 E – Proposed Levels Layout Plan Sheet 3 of 3
- 47 A – Exceedance Flow Route Plan
- 44 – Sections Through Site Key Plan
- 45 – Sections Through Site
- 2456-TF-XX-00-DR-L-1001 P06 – Landscape General Arrangements 1
- 2456-TF-XX-00-DR-L-1002 P06 – Landscape General Arrangements 2
- 2456-TF-XX-00-DR-L-1003 P06 – Landscape General Arrangements 3
- 2456-TF-XX-00-DR-L-1004 P06 – Landscape General Arrangements 4
- 2456-TF-XX-00-DR-L-1005 P05 – Landscape General Arrangements
- 15 C – Site Layout Visibility Splay
- 48 – Existing Site Layout Plan
- 17 Rev. E – Refuse Vehicle Tracking
- 50 Rev. A – Refuse Vehicle Tracking to Narrowing in Main Access
- 51 Rev. A – Refuse Vehicle Tracking (Cars passing / waiting)
- 53 – Site Access Narrowing plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Arboricultural Report

The development must accord with the Arboricultural Implications Report ref. SJA air 23221-01 (October 2024). No excavation, demolition or development related works shall commence until the tree protection measures have been installed as per the tree protection plan contained within the report. Once installed, no access by vehicles or placement of goods, chemicals, fuels, soil or other materials shall take place within the protected area. Tree protection measures shall be retained in their approved form for the duration of the work and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Arboricultural Supervision

Notwithstanding the information submitted to date, no development related works shall take place on site until a final Arboricultural Method Statement, to include full details of supervision activities and reporting methods, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved document shall be adhered to in full in

accordance with the approved plans and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To retain and protect the existing trees which form an important part of the amenity of the locality, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Adherence to Ecological Impact Assessment

The ecological enhancements for the site shall accord with the recommendations set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment Revision 3 (Ecosa, December 2024), with further detail to be provided in accordance with the requirements of Condition 14 of the outline planning permission ref. O/19/86980.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the locality and to ensure the protection of wildlife and supporting habitat found on the site and to secure opportunities for the improvement of wildlife corridors and wider enhancement of the nature conservation value of the site.

Great crested newt management

No development shall start on site until a great crested newt licence method statement and a habitat management plan, to include the location of the receptor site and hibernacula and translocation data, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that great crested newts are not harmed by the development, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Reptile management

No development shall start on site until a Reptile Management Plan, to include the location of the receptor site and hibernacula and translocation data, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that reptiles are not harmed by the development, in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Pergola details

Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, the pergolas in the parking court on the north side of the site shall be installed and thereafter retained in accordance with full details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the pergolas are of an appropriate design to prevent obstruction to parked vehicles, to ensure suitable provision of parking on site in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Cycle storage details

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, cycle storage facilities shall be installed and thereafter retained in accordance with full details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To encourage the use of alternative means of transport to the private car in accordance with Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Final landscape details

No development shall start on site until final details of soft landscaping, boundary treatments and hard surfacing (to cover all points outlined in the letter from Gillings Planning dated 31 January 2025, including a detailed planting plan at 1:200 scale), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and to the appropriate British Standard.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the locality, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Boardwalk details

Prior to installation of the boardwalk shown on the approved plans on the south side of the site, full details of the materials to be used, including manufacturers details and samples, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boardwalk shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and longevity, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Noise mitigation

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the Noise Assessment (24 Acoustics, ref. R10059-1 Rev. 3, dated 17 October 2024). Verification that the internal noise mitigation measures have been implemented in accordance with the approved details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the dwellings, to include verification of performance for a sample of individual dwellings in accordance with a schedule to be agreed with the LPA. The noise mitigation measures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

Drainage

No development shall start on site until an addendum to the Drainage technical Note (The Civil Engineering Practice, October 2024, ref. 23823 1.1), and a final version of the submitted Proposed Drainage Layout Plan Whole Site and Sheet 3 of 3, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the surface water discharged from the drainage pipe running along the road to the east of the pond system will have at least **two forms of** filtration before being discharged off site, **unless sufficient justification is provided for an alternative solution**. The drainage strategy shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure the provision of satisfactory surface water drainage infrastructure to serve the development.

Sediment impact mitigation

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Silt and Sedimentation Impact Assessment and Mitigation Strategy (The Civil Engineering Practice, October 2024, ref. 23823 Version 1.1).

Reason: To ensure that the development would not impact on the integrity of the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation through the release of sediments.

Public Right of Way connection

No development, shall start on site until a detailed plan showing how the new footpath links connect to the existing Public Right of Way has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in liaison with Hampshire Countryside Service. The footpath links shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the dwellings.

Reason: To ensure suitable connection to and protection of the Public Right of Way.

Informatives:

Note to applicant: Southern Water will require a formal application for a connection to the public sewer. To make an application, please visit Southern Water's Get Connected Service: [Home](#).

Note to applicant: There must be no surface alterations to the PROW network or removal of furniture without the consent of Hampshire County Council as Highway Authority. Planning permission does not provide this and separate consent is required via a Section 278 agreement. This must be secured prior to commencement of development.

No vehicles (including builder and contractor vehicles), machinery, equipment, materials, spoil, scaffolding or anything else associated with the works, use or occupation of the development, shall be left on or near to the public right of way as to cause obstruction, hindrance, or a hazard to users. The public retain the right to use the public right of way at all times.

The PROW network is to remain open and accessible at all times during construction and occupation of the development, including clearing of vegetation adjacent to the PROW. If it is considered impractical to keep the PROW open during any phase of construction, a temporary closure will need to be applied for. Further information can be found via the following link: [Apply for a temporary closure | Environment | Hampshire County Council](#)

Note to applicant: The developer is advised that roads and footways should be designed to minimum industry standards and / or Hampshire County Council's best practice. Further information can be found at: [Information for highways developers | Transport and roads | Hampshire County Council](#). The developer should also be aware of the Advanced Payment Code that will be required by the Highway Authority.

Note to applicant: Any works that would impact on the highway bank between the site and Allbrook Way would need to be undertaken via S278 Agreement with Hampshire County Council. Further details of this process can be found at: [Section 278 agreement | Transport and roads | Hampshire County Council](#)

Note to applicant: The planting specifications should include night scented flowering plants to ensure a sufficient supply of insects for bats. A wide variety of flowering plants that flower over a long season is needed to attract insects as food for bats and swifts.

Note to applicant: Bat and bird boxes and any habitat used by bats must not be illuminated above 1 lux. Lighting should be shown as part of the biodiversity enhancement plan to be submitted under Condition 14 of the outline planning permission.

Note to applicant: The archaeology works need to be coordinated with the mitigation required for great crested newts and reptiles.

Note to applicant: If the proposals include works to an ordinary watercourse, under the Land Drainage Act 1991, as amended by the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, prior consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority is required (as a separate permission to planning).

Note to applicant: As the internal roads are not due for adoption, the developer would be advised to ensure that arrangements are in place for the private management of the road, to prevent issues such as unauthorised parking and obstructions on bends.