

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/25/98926

Site Address: 87 SWAYTHLING ROAD, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3AG

Case Officer: Gary Osmond

Description: Construction of 1No. detached three bedroom dwelling with associated off-street car parking and private amenity space

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 ☐
F/24/96952	Erection of 3-bedroom detached dwelling and associated landscaping following demolition of existing garage.	Refused April 2024
H/22/93282	Part retrospective erection of lean-to structure on side for ancillary storage.	Approved Oct 2022
H/22/92484	Part retrospective 2.6m boundary treatment change.	Approved May 2021
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.	Approved April 2021
H/20/88618	Two-storey rear extension, hip to gable extension, front and rear dormer and elevational alterations.	Approved Nov 2020
Z/31765/002/00	Construction of dropped kerb.	Approved June 2001

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	Three representations have been received, two objecting on the grounds listed below, and one commenting that whilst the design is 'nicer' than the previous refusal, access to the site is still poor. Reasons for objecting: - Overlooking and loss of privacy - Noise and disruption during construction - Overdevelopment of the site - Out of keeping with the pattern of development in the locality - Visually intrusive - Impact on local infrastructure - Poor and unsuitable access to the site - Would set a precedent for similar development in the area - Loss of outlook and light - Impact on local wildlife - Increased flooding - Loss of WWII air raid shelter - Devaluation of property		
West End Parish Council:	No comments received.		
Ecology:	Holding Objection.		

	This site is in a green impact risk zone for great crested newts. There are records of bats, badgers, nesting swifts and hedgehogs near this site. Current photos of the site submitted in the small sites metric show the existing vegetation and the remains of at least one outbuilding. The photos show that there is potential for nesting birds, hedgehogs, bats, common reptiles such as slow worms and terrestrial great crested newts to be using this site. When potential habitat for protected and priority species exists on site, a preliminary ecological appraisal (Phase 1 survey) completed by a suitably qualified ecologist is required to assess whether these species could be harmed by the development and recommend appropriate mitigation to protect them. In some cases, further Phase II surveys may be required. Ecology raises a holding objection until a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been submitted. The report should also contain recommendations for species specific mitigation for loss of habitat such as built-in bat and swift nest boxes, hedgehog holes in fences, areas where hedgehogs can shelter, and hibernacula for common reptiles.
Trees:	Holding Objection. Whilst there are no significant trees within the application site boundary, there are offsite trees which are subject to preservation orders. However, no arboricultural information has been provided to demonstrate the impact of the development upon neighbouring trees, meaning the proposals cannot be suitably assessed.
Environmental Health:	No objection. The design and access statement indicates that the site currently hosts a dilapidated garage and shelter, overgrown vegetation and raised areas formed with concrete retaining walls and hardstanding, therefore, limited made ground is anticipated. The application has not included details existing structures onsite and its materials (i.e. could contain asbestos). Whilst we do not object with the principle of the development, it is recommended that a watching brief should be maintained at all times during demolition of existing structures and construction works for unexpected contamination.
Highways:	No objection. Access to the site is existing and has historically been used for vehicular access to the double garage. Parking for the existing dwelling will still be available to its frontage. The number of vehicle movements associated with a single dwelling will have no impact upon the local highway. However, there is a need to ensure that the access to Eden Road, which is used by pedestrians, is kept clear at all times, particularly during construction.
EBC Estates:	Objection. The applicant has stated that they are the owner of all the land for the development, but this is incorrect. EBC own the access strip to Eden Road under title number HP 449687. Access was granted to the previous occupier of 87 Swaythling Road by way of a licence, which was personal to them and not transferable. The right of access was for vehicle or pedestrians, to access the rear of 87 Swaythling Road and for no other purpose.

Site Visit:	Yes ☐	No ☒
No site visit was undertaken as part of this latest planning application. However, the case officer did visit the site as part of the previously refused application in April 2024.		

Policy:
National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S2; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM6, DM8, DM11, DM13, DM14, DM23, DM29, DM30 & DM38. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisal – Hedge End, West End and Botley; Trees and Development.

Assessment:
Context: This part of West End is predominantly residential in nature, made up of a mixture of single and two storey dwellings of varying ages and architectural styles. No.87 is an interwar / immediate postwar two storey semi-detached dwelling fronting Swaythling Road, which has been recently substantially enlarged. The application site lies at the end of its rear garden and is also made up of land which appears to have once been part of the garden of No.85 Swaythling Road. Half the site is taken up by a large flat roof garage/workshop which is currently in a very poor state of repair. The other half of the site is very overgrown and difficult to access. Access to the site would be via a short section of track from Eden Road to the west of the site, which continues behind properties which front Eden Road, and which is regularly used by pedestrians and dog walkers. This land and the track are within Council ownership. The application site also sits at the northern end of a strip of woodland which runs along the edge of the track. This wooded area is covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Proposal: The application proposes the construction of a two storey three bedroom detached dwelling accessed from Eden Road via an unpaved track. Parking for two cars would be provided to its frontage, with a private garden to the side and rear. The proposals also include the construction of a 3.0 metre high stepped retaining wall to the rear of the site. Policy & Principle: The application site lies within the urban edge and within an established residential area where the basic principle of new residential development is considered acceptable. However, any formal planning approval is dependent upon how well that proposed is considered to accord with the relevant policies of the adopted Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents. In this instance the main policies to be considered are DM1, DM11, DM13 and DM14. Policy DM1 requires all new development to not have an unacceptable impact, and where possible to enhance: the amenity of new and existing residents; the character and appearance of the area; biodiversity; and the significance of heritage assets. It requires proposals to make efficient use of a site, but in a manner which takes full and proper account of the context and constraints of the site, and that of the surrounding locality. It must be compatible with adjoining uses and well-integrated in terms of mass, scale,

materials, layout, density, design and siting in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings. It should not involve the loss or damage to trees and other natural features of value, unless they can be replaced with features of equivalent or enhanced value. The policy also sets out a number of other requirements which are not directly relevant to the nature of the development proposed in this instance.

Policy DM11 relates to nature conservation and requires all new development to protect, conserve and enhance designated nature conservation sites, networks of natural habitats and features, seek a net gain in biodiversity through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing and provision of new habitats and features of nature conservation interest.

Policies DM13 and DM14 relate to transport matters and parking provision. DM13 requires all new development to have safe and convenient access to the highway network and make provision for access to, and by, other transport modes including public transport and cycle and pedestrian routes as appropriate. It also requires site access to meet appropriate standards, to not cause or increase danger to road users or have a detrimental impact upon the operation of the highway. The policy also sets out other requirements in relation to traffic generation and the potential need for mitigation measures, although this will not be necessary in this instance. Policy DM14 requires new residential to provide off-highway parking which conforms to the requirements of the Council's adopted 'Residential Parking standards' SPD.

In basic principle, that proposed is acceptable. However, there are a number of detailed issues which are of concern and set out in more detail below.

Previous Refusal:

The previously refused scheme, whilst also a three bedroom dwelling, was of a more 'traditional' design approach in terms of its form and use of materials. However, the main concern was its size, its position within the plot, and its failure to appropriately take into consideration the site constraints, in particular the significant change in levels between the site and immediately neighbouring land. It was subsequently refused on the grounds of layout, scale and design, resulting in a cramped and constrained plot which would not have been able to provide an appropriate private external amenity space, nor a suitable setting and quality of environment for future occupiers. It was also considered to be out of keeping with the prevailing character of development in the locality.

In addition to this main reason for refusal, the scheme was refused on the grounds of unacceptable impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties through creating an overbearing sense of enclosure. There were further reasons for refusal on the grounds of lack of information in relation to impact upon adjacent protected trees, as well as failure to secure appropriate mitigation for the development's impact upon protected waters.

Layout, Form, Scale & Design:

That proposed takes a more contemporary design approach than that previously refused, using vertical timber cladding, render and slate roof and slate hung walls, as well as more modern window proportions and vegetated green-roofs to single storey flat roof projections to the front and rear.

As a design that proposed is not unattractive, albeit does not really follow any existing design cues from the locality. Notwithstanding, there is no objection to the architectural design approach taken, given the site does not really form part of the character of either Swaythling Road or Eden Road, which does raise some concern as to whether development of the site is appropriate given the prevailing pattern of development in the locality does not include 'back land' development.

Putting aside whether development of the site would adversely impact the character of the locality, the principal concern with that proposed is the size of the dwelling's footprint and the ability to successfully accommodate the necessary ancillary external spaces required with the space remaining and in a manner which would provide a good quality

environment for future occupiers. Whilst two parking spaces are shown on the site layout plan, these are squeezed tightly between the front wall of the dwelling and the front boundary. Although an area is shown for turning vehicles, again this appears to be very tight and lacks the space to be able to turn a vehicle around.

In terms of garden space, whilst the area proposed does meet the 60% of internal floorspace minimum set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD, the useability and quality of this space is questioned. Although better than the previously refused scheme, the garden space will still be dominated by the 3.0 metre high retaining wall to its eastern boundary and the steeply sloping raised southern boundary, both of which would have 1.8 – 2.0 metre boundary fences on top. These high boundaries, together with the sizable trees immediately to the south-west of the site, and the proposed dwelling itself, will result in significant shading of the garden space, which in turn will result in dark and dull interior spaces.

Although not an overdevelopment of the site, the design and layout of that proposed does not adequately take into account the particular physical constraints of the site, which as with the previous scheme will 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 adopted Local Plan, as well as the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD.

Street Scene & Area Character:

As mentioned above, the proposed dwelling would not really form a part of either Swaythling Road or Eden Road, so would not impact the street scene of either to any great extent. However, development of the site would introduce a form of back land development which does not yet exist in the immediate locality. Whilst in principle development of the site is acceptable, it should ideally be subservient and relatively inconspicuous when compared to existing development which fronts Eden Road. However, there are reservations as to the size and scale of that proposed and whether it will sit comfortably within the existing character of the locality.

Whilst development of the site would tidy up what is currently something of an eyesore (albeit the site does not need to be redeveloped for this to be achieved) thought as to how its 'frontage' onto the access track, and the track itself, would be treated is required. Will the development be set behind fencing/hedging and would the track be resurfaced with something more appropriate to the nature of that proposed? Whilst these are issues which could be dealt with at a later stage, it is not clear if such issues have yet been considered. They are important matters which will make the difference between a well-considered good quality development which assimilates successfully into the locality, or an awkward alien feature dropped into the site.

Amenity:

Future Occupiers:

The concerns as to the quality of the proposed external amenity space have already been set out above. This will also have an impact upon the internal main habitable spaces, which at ground floor level will have the garden spaces as their main outlook. There will be some views to the front/side, but these would be onto the driveway and not any better in terms of the quality of outlook provided. Being an isolated site, i.e. having no traditional street frontage, the quality of outlook will be entirely dependent upon what space is available immediately around the building and how this is treated.

Natural light available to the main ground floor living spaces is also of some concern, albeit this is addressed to some extent through the use of glazed lanterns in the roofs of the single storey projections to the front and rear.

Outlook and light to the first floor accommodation is less of a concern. However, there are concerns that Bedroom 3, which sits to the rear of the first floor plan, will suffer a loss of privacy from the second floor rear window of No.87 Swaythling Road. The Council's 'Quality Places' SPD requires a minimum of 22 metres between first floor facing windows so as to maintain an acceptable degree of privacy between dwellings. However, it also states that this distance needs to be increased by 5.0 metres for every storey above first floor. Given that the ground level differences between No.87 and the proposed dwelling equate to just over a normal storey height, there should really be a minimum distance of 27 metres between first floor windows. That proposed will only provide a separation of 24 metres. Although, provided a sufficiently high boundary fence is provided to the end of No.87's garden, this should block direct views between first floor windows. However, a boundary fence will not block direct views being available from the second floor rear window of No.87 down into the rear of the proposed dwelling. To accord with the 'Quality Places' SPD these should be a separation distance of 32 metres (22 + 5 + 5), which cannot be provided, and will therefore result in a loss of privacy to future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, contrary to the SPD and Policy DM1.

Existing Neighbours:

One of the reasons for refusal of the previous application was the proposal's impact upon the amenity of Nos.83, 85 & 87 Swaythling Road due to what was considered to be an unacceptable and overbearing impact, caused as a result of the proposed dwelling's height, scale and close proximity to the boundaries of these properties. This current scheme appears to have addressed this to a reasonable extent, through reducing the height of the dwelling, the scale of the first floor accommodation, and pulling the first floor element away from these sensitive boundaries. Whilst the concerns raised by neighbours in respect to visual impact are noted, in planning terms that proposed is likely to be acceptable in this regard.

In terms of other amenity issues, that proposed will not result in any unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy, loss of light, or loss of general outlook due to the proposed dwelling's orientation, proximity and relationship to existing neighbouring dwellings.

The concerns raised in relation to disturbance during construction are noted. Whilst building works will inevitably result in a degree of disturbance to neighbours, this should only be for a relatively short temporary period. Were the application to be approved, conditions could be applied in relation to the provision, approval and adherence to a Construction Management Plan, as well as restrictions to working hours, etc. which would provide a reasonable degree of protection for neighbours.

Access, Parking & Highways:

In terms of highway impact, as has been set out in the response from Hampshire Highways, the number of vehicle movements associated with a single dwelling will have no noticeable impact upon the local highway network.

As for parking, whilst the proposed site layout plan shows two on-plot parking spaces, which would meet the requirements of the 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD, as discussed above, there are concerns with regard to the ability to be able to turn a vehicle around on the plot with the space available. Without a tracking drawing to confirm this is possible this remains a concern. If vehicles cannot turn around on site, this will result in them having to reverse up or down the access track, which raises concerns in relation to pedestrian safety along the track and along the pavement of Eden Road. sightlines when existing the track onto Eden Road are quite poor and would be made worse by having to reverse out of the access.

In addition to the safety concerns of having to reverse along the access track, there are concerns that reversing will result in a greater degree of noise and disturbance to Nos. 78 & 80 Eden Road, which lies either side of the track. Vehicles when reversing often make more noise, due to the use of a higher ratio gear, or with modern electric vehicles, audible

warning noises. This would be detrimental to the amenity of these neighbouring properties.

A further issue in relation to site access is that the applicant does not appear to have a right to use the track as vehicular access to the site. Whilst consent was granted to a previous owner of No.87 to use the track to access the existing dilapidated garage, this was via a licence agreement which was none-transferable. As such, the applicant does not have a right to access the site from Eden Road. From a planning perspective, this is not necessarily a reason to consider refusal of the application, or whether the LPA is in a position to determine the application, as this is a legal matter which could be negotiated and agreed between the applicant and the Council's estates team. However, it does highlight that further investigations by the applicant are required.

Trees & Ecology:

The Council's Arboriculturist 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 warrant reason for refusal for being contrary to Policies DM1 and DM11.

This site is in a green impact risk zone for great crested newts and there are records of bats, badgers, nesting swifts and hedgehogs near the site. Current photos of the site submitted in the small sites metric show the existing vegetation and the remains of the garage/workshop. The photos show that there is potential for nesting birds, hedgehogs, bats, common reptiles such as slow worms and terrestrial great crested newts to be using this site. When potential habitat for protected and priority species exists on site, a preliminary ecological appraisal (Phase 1 survey) completed by a suitably qualified ecologist is required to assess whether these species could be harmed by the development and recommend appropriate mitigation to protect them. Again, this information has not been provided, without which the LPA cannot assess the potential impact of the development. As such, the application is contrary to Policy DM11 of the adopted Local Plan, and this will form a further reason for refusal.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

The biodiversity net gain small sites metric submitted with the application shows that there is the potential for a net gain of over 400%. However, specific details as to how this could be achieved have not been provided.

Recreational disturbance

The site lies within the 13.8km catchment area for the New Forest Special Protection Area and within the 5.6km catchment area for the Solent Bird Aware Scheme. As such, mitigation is required for recreational disturbance upon the Solent and New Forest resulting from the development. The applicant can make use of the two relevant Council schemes. However, the necessary contributions have not been secured. As such, this will form part of a further reason for refusal.

Nutrients

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

The application site would use the Portswood wastewater treatment works, which discharges into The Southampton Water. As such the proposed development is required to achieve nutrient neutrality for nitrogen. Eastleigh Borough Council has a scheme which takes land out of agricultural uses and creates recreational spaces, thus reducing the nutrient output of the land. This scheme would be available to the applicant, although they

have not confirmed if they intend to make use of this scheme or provide another form of mitigation. In either case, suitable mitigation can be secured by way of an appropriately worded planning condition were the application to be approved.

Habitats Regulations

Any proposed residential development in this area will have a likely impact upon The Solent SPAs. As such, an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations would need to be completed and forwarded to Natural England for comment were the application recommended for approval. However, as the application is to be recommended for refusal, no assessment has been undertaken, albeit the lack of securing appropriate mitigation will form a further reason for refusal should the planning application be appealed, thereby allowing the matter to be suitably addressed.

Drainage & Servicing:

Risk of increased flooding has been raised as a concern by a neighbour to the application site. Whilst it is noted that there are various level differences between sites, it is not entirely clear what the existing situation is in relation to surface water run-off/infiltration. Given half the existing site is already developed, it may be the case that its redevelopment in the manner proposed will have little impact. Nothing has been provided which indicates that this could be a significant issue. Notwithstanding, a condition requiring details of foul and surface water drainage proposals could be included as part of any planning approval. It is also the case that any surface water drainage will need to be undertaken in a sustainable manner to accord with the requirements of Policy DM6.

With regards to servicing, whilst providing utilities should be relatively straight forward, there are some reservations as to the practicalities of refuse collection and deliveries to the site. Refuse vehicles will not be able to use the existing access track, meaning that refuse bins will need to be placed at the end of the track on collection days. Given the narrow width of the track, it may prove difficult for vehicles to use the track if bins are placed at the end. However, it would not be acceptable for bins to be placed on the footway of Eden Road or upon the driveways of neighbouring properties. Equally, the same concerns in relation to access and the ability to turn a vehicle around raised above are also of relevance for delivery vans, etc. Whilst these issues on their own are not sufficient to warrant refusal of the application, they do demonstrate the practical difficulties of developing the application 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. When considering the impact of climate

change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use. Various possible solutions have been highlighted within the supporting Design and Access Statement but not specific measures have been highlighted.

5 Year Land Supply:

The provision of one additional dwelling on the site would have a limited contribution towards the Council's housing land supply. The Council has recently updated its five year housing land supply calculation, which demonstrates a land supply of 4.1 years. In accordance with paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework but it is considered that the modest benefit of providing one additional dwelling would not outweigh the outlined harmful impacts of the development which are contrary to the adopted policies of the EBC Local Plan.

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 ☒

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 poor quality 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.

It has also not been demonstrated that the proposed development will not result in harm to protected trees or protected species.

For the reasons discussed above and set out below, the application is recommended 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 'Quality Places' Supplementary Planning Document and the provisions of the NPPF (Dec 2024).

- 2) 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' Supplementary Planning Document and the provisions of the NPPF (Dec 2024).
- 3) Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed dwelling and associated works would not have an adverse impact upon protected species which are known to be in the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), the Council's 'Biodiversity' Supplementary Planning Document and the provisions of the NPPF (Dec 2024).
- 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 (Dec 2024). and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.