

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT:**Application Ref:** F/25/98800**Site Address:** OAK LODGE, BRIDGE ROAD, BURSLEDON**Case Officer:** Clare Martin**Description:** Construction of 1no. detached two storey dwelling

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Within urban edge • Whole site covered by a blanket tree preservation order • Within 2m Sewer Buffer • Close to SGN gas pipeline & Esso oil pipeline • Within Air Quality Management Area • Within Solent Mitigation and Disturbance Zone • Within New Forest Mitigation and Disturbance Zone • Nutrient Neutrality – Nitrates only		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
The most recent applications are: • X/23/95903 – Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and condition 10 (details) and removal of condition 13 (stopping up of existing access) to accommodate relocation of Plot 1of planning permission F/20/87926 – Permitted (August 2024) • DC/22/92965 - Discharge of conditions 3 (method statement), 4 (arboricultural report), 5 (arboricultural method statement), 8 (preliminary investigation), 10 (materials), 11 (drainage) and 12 (noise report) of planning permission F/20/87926 • F/22/93988 - Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of a single storey 3 bedroom dwelling with associated parking – Permitted (August 2023) • F/20/87926 - Construction of 6no. five bed dwellings, conversion of existing outbuilding to 1no. 3 bed dwelling and the refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Lodge with associated garages / car parking, new access from Bridge Road, landscaping and associated works – Permitted (February 2021).		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	<u>1 letter of support (2 Old Bridge Close)</u> The proposal would enable another beautiful family home to be built in the area, making use of the pervious derelict site.		
Urban Design:	No objection <u>Loss of amenity space</u> It is disappointing that the accommodation of this additional dwelling involves the loss of amenity space and several new trees from the recent neighbour development. The outdoor private amenity space is fundamental part of all developments both in supporting residents' wellbeing and the ecology and biodiversity of the local area as such new developments must have adequate amount of external space <u>Detailed comments</u>		

	• It is welcomed that the building is significantly set back from the road respecting the existing building line and providing enough space to reinforce the planting buffer. • The proposal is too close to the boundary and careful consideration is needed to avoid any detrimental impact on adjoining land such as overbearing, overlooking and overshadowing/ loss of light issues. • The boundary will be quite exposed to the adjoining land therefore, there is the need to soften the edge. • The area between the proposal and Plot 1 of the adjacent site seems to have lack of natural surveillance and function. It would be interesting to understand how this space will be used in the future. • Consultation response provides suggestions on increasing the sustainability of the development.
Landscaping:	<u>Comment – 24/4/25</u> I have reviewed the latest revised GF site plan (Rev F) for this site, and it responds to the majority of my previous comments. Although the landscape scheme is far from ideal, I am willing to approve the revised proposals subject to full planting details at 1:200 scale being conditioned. Since the applicant has been fairly reluctant to seriously address landscape issues, perhaps you can ask for their written confirmation when the planting on this site is complete. It would then be worth the ULD Team carrying out a site visit to check the planting has been implemented as per the approved planting plans. <u>Comment</u> - A landscaping scheme is required This proposal sits in the middle of a previous (but recent) development and involves a loss of amenity space & new trees to accommodate this additional dwelling. This is disappointing. It is clear that around 8 new trees will be lost during construction, and the new proposal should focus on providing a good number of replacement trees to balance this loss. Some of these might need to be offsite within the approved application site. Please ask the agent what the purpose of the linear strip to the West of this Plot 9 is. This might be an area for trees and wildflower grass etc. The proposal will also require some planting to soften the public edge of the garden boundary e.g. a clipped hedge would be ideal. We should avoid an exposed CBF here.
Trees:	<u>Updated comments – 10/4/25 (subject to condition)</u> I have now reviewed the submitted arboricultural information (submitted instead pre-determination instead of pre-commencement). I will refer to “V3” within any condition that covers all of the arboricultural documents. The report is generally satisfactory. There is an issue with the quality of the tree protection plan – it is not easy to scale the area required for cellular confinement or easily see where tree protection fencing is proposed (this is principally an issue for onsite personnel). However, in this instance, because the risk to the tree T13 is relatively

	low (a driveway already exists and the proposal is for a modest widening), I feel that the clarity of the plan is less of an issue than under other circumstances. Please condition that the approved tree protection measures needs to be in place before development commences. <u>Comment 10/4/25</u> – Replacement Tree Planting Needed We have no objection to the removal of the exiting trees within the red line boundary – as shown on the site plan reference 1122 1021 Rev C – subject to compensation planting as per the Trees and Development SPD. Any trees that were planted (or were planned to be planted) under the previous, more extensive scheme (F/20/87926 and X/23/95903) and that have to be removed to enact these proposals (F/25/98800), must also be replaced. Please note: because those trees were conditioned as part of the previous planning permission, we consider them to exist, even if they have not yet been planted. We note that the Landscape Team have requested a Landscaping plan, so the above points can be covered in that requested information, and we will defer to their expertise in that regard. Finally, it is our understanding that the entrance will have to be widened to allow for two directional vehicle use. While we have no objection in principle, the widening may result in an impact on the rooting system of the significant and protected tree to the south east of the entrance (It is within the Root Protection Area), so it will be necessary to condition an arboricultural method statement to cover work in this area. Therefore, subject to the Landscape Team being satisfied with the replacement tree planting, we raise no arboricultural objection subject to a pre-commencement plan securing an arboricultural method statement and tree plan.
Ecology:	<u>Biodiversity Net Gain</u> – Comments It has been accepted by the Ecology Team that the BNG baseline should be the original BNG value of the site before any work started on the current planning permission, which covers the wider site. <u>Surface Water Drainage</u> – Further information required The surface water drainage scheme for the adjacent site was not designed to accommodate additional surface water drainage from this site. It is not clear what filtration the surface water is before leaving this site. The treatment of all surface water must be shown clearly on a plan. This plan does not show the approved drainage layout of the adjacent scheme. There is not enough information submitted to demonstrate that two forms of filtration are provided on this scheme. The Ecological Appraisal found areas of damp grassland, so the proposed permeable paving in this area may need to be tanked permeable paving specifically designed for areas with high ground water. <u>Ecology</u> – Comment

	This site is in a green impact risk zone for great crested newts. There are records of great crested newts in the wider area but the A27 is a likely barrier to dispersal. There are records of bats very close to this site and hedgehogs in the area. The property is approximately 300 m from the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA. I have reviewed the Ecological Appraisal by Aluco (January 2025). The site has been assessed as predominantly damp neutral grassland with areas of taller ruderal vegetation and scrub. An area of willow scrub was recently cut before the survey. There is also bramble scrub with some small hazel bushes. A veteran oak tree had been on site but fell during a storm in 2022, with only the stump remaining. The discussion on habitat degradation in section 6.4 and the baseline metric assessment information at 6.6.1 states that this willow scrub has been included in the habitat baseline. Precautionary working methods for badgers, hedgehogs, nesting birds, reptiles, and stag beetles will be required. Section 5.3.8 contains precautions for mammals and technical appendix 4 contains a method statement to protect reptiles. The shed and any vegetation to be removed to facilitate the development must be removed outside of bird nesting season (which is usually between the beginning of March and the end of August) or if this is not possible then only after being checked for nesting birds by a suitably qualified ecologist up to 24 hours before the start of works. If any active nests are found, work must stop, and a 5 m buffer must be erected around the nest to protect it from disturbance until after the birds have fledged and left the nest. Biodiversity enhancements recommended in the report (figure 4) include a swift brick on the northern elevation (shown in red on the as proposed northeast elevation) and a bat brick on the southern elevation of the new dwelling (shown in dark blue on the as proposed southeast elevation). If any exterior lighting is required for security purposes, the guidelines given in section 5.3.6 of the report must be followed. A lighting diagram can be conditioned.
Hampshire Highways:	No Objection (based on amended site plan) <u>Access</u> The site plan has site specific measurements annotated on it (minimum width 4.8m), and also formally flares the access junction from Bridge Road in order to achieved the minimum 4.8m width into the site to allow for two-way vehicle traffic movements as previously requested. Subject to a condition being applied to ensure that these works are undertaken, and that a minimum 4.8m width is provided for the access drive, with no constraints or pinch points up to the access drive to White Lodge, there would be no objection to the proposals. <u>Internal Layout</u> The site is reached via a private shared driveway, which narrows to single width just after the left turn into the 8 dwellings associated with White Lodge. This is acceptable, as the access to White Lodge essentially provides an internal passing place, with only one additional dwelling (Amokura House) being located further along the driveway.

	Four Parking spaces are provided for the proposed dwelling, 2 driveway and 2 garage, and the driveway layout provides an area within which to turn and arrive and leave the dwelling boundary within a forward gear. Whilst a bin drag will be required to Bridge Road, this is within a reasonable distance. It is understood that bin collections will be kerbside, and whilst this will result in the dwelling associated bin being left on the adjacent grass verge, this is acceptable given the quantum of development doing this, with White Lodge having its own bin store and path available
Environmental Health:	<u>Noise – No objection</u> The proposed dwelling is shown to be in close proximity to the A27 and therefor may be affected by road noise. The noise report reference SCL7014.200529.R1 dated May 2020 (Noise survey period July 2019) shows plot 1 closer to the A27 comparing to the proposed dwelling in this application and therefor the mitigation proposed for plot 1 should in theory achieve the noise criteria. This includes: • Glazing Performance as per Table 5.2 Page 10; • Ventilation Performance as per paragraph 6.1 Page 11; • Proposed Mitigation for the external amenity area as per paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 Page 12; • Upgrade insulation of the external walls as per paragraph 8.1 Page 13. I would suggest adding a condition for this application that requests the new dwelling to include the same noise mitigation strategy previously proposed for plot 1 as per the noise report reference SCL7014.200529.R1 dated May 2020. <u>Contaminated land – No objection</u> A review of previous planning application F/20/87926 documents, specifically the Ground Conditions Consultants GCC report entitled 'Ground Conditions Desk Top Study dated 06/04/2023 reference J22-040-R01 version 3.0' identified the following potential contamination sources: localised oil heating from possible former fuel tank, asbestos containing material from construction of adjacent properties, and ground gas from organic soils from adjacent site. The risk assessment indicates very low to low/moderate risk to human health from future site users. The consultant considered that no further assessment is necessarily required; however, they recommended that a watching brief should be employed to ensure unexpected contamination is appropriately managed. A response from EBC Pollution Team was provided on 12/05/2024, indicating agreement with this approach, and adding that evidence of any imported soils should be submitted and approved by the LPA. Subsequently, the associated condition 8 (contaminated land) of F/20/87926 was discharged. Based on the considerations above, we have no objections in terms of contaminated land for the construction of the additional dwelling to the south west of the site boundary as shown in the ground floor site plan prepared by R&R Design Studio Ltd (November 2024) reference

	1122-102, provided that a watching brief is followed at all times during construction works, and the discovery strategy procedure as detailed in the GCC report on the event of any unexpected contamination. <u>Air Quality – No objection</u> The proposed development is within Hamble Air Quality Management Area. An air quality report was submitted as part of previous application F/20/87926 (SJM Environmental, reference 1129), indicating that there are no air quality constraints associated with the wider development. We have agreed with the conclusions of the report (via email sent on 20/07/2020) and have no objections with the additional proposed dwelling. Even though it does not represent a significant risk on air quality, we stress the importance of adopting best practices and measures to safeguard air quality in the area and recommend follow the procedures on the approved CEMP.
Esso Pipeline	No Objection
Southern Gas Network:	No response
Natural England (comment on HRA):	Objection – Recreational impacts upon the New Forest SAC, SPA & Ramsar Site. As the use of the Eastleigh Borough Council mitigation scheme is not precautionary enough. The use off the Eastleigh Borough Council nitrates mitigation project is considered ecologically sound.
Parish Council:	No response

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Carried out 27/2/25		

Pre-commencement Conditions:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: Emailed agent		

Legislation:
Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:- <i>"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."</i>

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 (sustainable development), S2 (approach to development), S3 (location of new housing); Development Management Policies DM1 (general development), DM2 (environmentally sustainable development), DM3 (climate change), DM6 (surface water management), DM10 (water and waste water), DM11 (nature conservation), DM13 (access), DM14 (parking), DM23 (residential development within urban areas), DM29 (Dwellings with higher access standards) & DM30 (internal space standards) Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Planning History and Proposal:

Construction work is underway on the eight houses to the north and west of the application site (under planning permission X/23/95903). As part of this permission, the application site was to be retained as green space accommodating some of the replacement tree planting for trees lost to the development. The green space also included wildflower planting and hedgerows to provide the required biodiversity net gain as well as some recreational benefits for the new residents.

Instead, the proposal will replace the green space with a two storey five bedroomed detached house. The scheme includes an attached double garage at the side and a garden wrapping around the side and rear of the property. There are two parking spaces to the front with access off the existing private drive (serving White Lodge & Amokura), which connects to Bridge Road.

The proposal will involve the further loss of five trees to make way for the new property, the largest of which has already been removed due to storm damage. However, the scheme has managed to resite eleven out of twelve replacement trees (secured under the previous planning application X/23/95903) and so will result in an overall reduction of six trees. The proposal also includes a replacement 6m wide strip of wildflower planting at the side of the property (over the easement for the gap pipeline).

Assessment:

Principle

The site is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable. While it is disappointing to lose green space to a new dwelling, the scheme does include some replacement tree and wildflower planting. There are also other smaller green spaces and pockets of landscaping throughout the housing development, which provide an appropriate setting as well as ecological benefits.

The site is within a large residential area on the northern edge of Bursledon, and there are other open spaces, parks and play areas within walking distance. Furthermore, developing the green space for a new house would make a more efficient use of urban land, which is encouraged by planning policy. As such, on balance, the principle of a new house on the site is considered acceptable (subject to the detailed matters according with the relevant planning policies).

Character and Appearance

Policy DM1 requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be well integrated with these (in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting), both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views.

The proposal is for a five bedroomed, detached, two storey dwelling in a generous landscaped plot. The new house sits next to the flats at White Lodge following the existing Providence Hill building line to the northwest.

The house is of a pleasant design with front gable, bay window, chimney and includes a mixture of timber cladding, bricks and brick detailing. The proposal includes a double garage, which although large, is unobtrusively sited at the side of the house. The design and size of the new house reflects the new properties currently being constructed at Oak Lodge and should integrate well with the character and appearance of the locality.

The proposal also includes a landscaping scheme with additional hedging along part of the site boundaries and some replacement trees within the rear garden and green spaces

surrounding the new house. This will help the property blend into the wider housing development, replacing some of the trees previously lost and provide an appropriate setting for the property.

Living Conditions

Policies DM1 & DM30 requires all new dwellings to provide a good living environment for their future residents and to meet the Nationally Described Space Standards. In terms of external amenity space, Quality Places SPD requires all new residential developments to provide an outdoor amenity space of at least 60% of the dwellings floor space.

The proposed house has a floor area of 180m², which conformably meets the nationally described space standards for two storey, five bedroom, dwellings. The new house has a sizable garden (well over the 60% standard) and the property will receive good daylight and outlook.

Residential Amenity

Policy DM1 amongst other matters, stipulates that all new development should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities of both new and existing residents. Additional residential amenity guidance is provided within the Council's Quality Places SPD.

The nearest residential properties are the flats at White lodge, some of which have balconies on their eastern side elevation overlooking the application site. There is 20m separation distance between the existing living room balcony, kitchen and bedroom windows in the flats which face new side facing window of bedroom 5. As the flat windows/ balconies serve primary living spaces and are less than 22m away then an obscure glazing condition will be imposed for bedroom 5. This is to ensure that there is no unacceptable overlooking between the existing flats and new dwelling.

Otherwise, the dwelling is positioned a reasonable distance away from neighbouring residential properties so as not to materially affect their outlook, daylight or privacy.

Highways and Car Parking

Policy DM13 requires that all new development has a safe and convenient access to the highway network, with Policy DM14 requiring three on site car parking to be provided in accordance with the Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD.

There are two marked parking spaces on the property's driveway with additional car parking provided within the attached double garage. The scheme makes provision for cars to turn cars within the access road so they can enter and leave the site in a forward gear onto Bridge Road. Amended plans have been received widening the existing junction and private access onto the Bridge Road, so that cars can pull of the main road and pass each other. The details have been reviewed by highways team and no objection raised, subject to conditions.

Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain

Policy DM11 states that development will not be permitted if it is likely to have a direct or indirect adverse effect on priority habitats, protected or priority species. The National Planning Policy Framework also requires all new dwellings to demonstrate a 10% biodiversity net gain (unless it qualifies for an exemption).

The proposal is supported by an ecological appraisal which provides recommendations for limiting impact on birds, bats, mammals, reptiles and amphibians. With these in place, the proposal is not considered to have an impact on important species and no objection has been raised by the Ecology Officer.

In terms of biodiversity net gain, the base figure is the condition of the land before any work on the wider application site began and this has been used within the submitted biodiversity net gain matrix. The scheme includes replacement trees and wildflower planting in order to maximise on site biodiversity net gain and the proposal includes swift and bat bricks. However, the developer will also need to purchase biodiversity credits in order to achieve the full 10% biodiversity net gain (and proof provided by condition).

Trees

Policy DM1 requires development not to result in the loss or damage of important trees. Further guidance on this issue is provided within the Council's Trees and Development SPD.

The site is covered by a blanket TPO and the application is supported by arboricultural assessment. The information has reviewed by the Tree Officer and no objection raised subject to tree fencing being in place before work starts on widening the site entrance, which is close to protected trees.

Sustainable Drainage

Policies DM3 and DM6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulate that new development must provide sustainable drainage systems (SuDs) wherever feasible including two forms of filtration. Drainage plans have been received which demonstrate that the hard surfacing will be constructed from permeable paving and surface water run off will be directed into an underground storage tank before being released into a watercourse.

Pollution

Policy DM8 states that development susceptible to pollution (including air or water, noise or vibration, light intrusion or land contamination) will not be permitted where it will be adversely affected by such pollution, unless measures can be taken that adequately mitigate the polluting effects.

In this case, the site is in close proximity to the A27 and so the new residents have the potential to be adversely affected by road noise and fumes. However, the proposed house will use the glazing specifications and ventilation agreed for the neighbouring properties currently being constructed at the wider site. This is considered sufficient to protect the new residents from road noise.

In terms of ground contamination, potential contamination sources are localised oil heating from possible former fuel tank, asbestos containing material from construction of adjacent properties, and ground gas from organic soils from adjacent site. The risk assessment submitted as part of the previous development indicates very low to low/moderate risk to human health from future site users and a watching brief condition will be imposed to deal with any unexpected contamination.

Impact of SPA:

Recreational Disturbance

The site is within both the 5.6km catchment area for the Solent Special Protection Area and Ramsar Site and the 13.8km catchment area for the New Forest Special Protection Area. It is recognised that new housing developments within these catchment areas are likely to result in additional visitors to these protected sites. In order to mitigate for this impact, the developer has paid a contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy (which manages visitors to the coastline) and the Council's New Forest Mitigation Strategy (which provides Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces within the borough and funds a ranger post within the New Forest).

Nutrients

The site is within the impact zone for nitrogen, which has been shown to have a determinantal impact on the water quality of the Southampton and Solent Water Special Protection Area. A nutrient budget has been submitted for the development and this has a positive output for nitrogen. The applicant intends to use the Eastleigh Borough Council scheme to mitigate for these increases and this will be secured by a pre- occupation condition.

An appropriate assessment under the habitat regulations has been completed for the development and Natural England have confirmed that the Council's nitrogen mitigation is acceptable. Natural England are comfortable with the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy but have objected to the Council's New Forest Mitigation Strategy. However, the Local Planning Authority, as competent authority, is content that the New Forest Migration Strategy is acceptable and delivers the appropriate levels of mitigation. The formal twenty one day notification of permission has been given to Natural England and this has now expired.

As such the proposal is likely to have a detrimental impact on the Special Protection Area, both in terms of recreational disturbance and an increase in nutrients.

Equalities Act:

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty.

Section 149 (1) states:

A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups.

It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

Climate Change:

In July 2019, the Council declared a Climate Change and Environmental Emergency. In doing so it agreed, among other things, to: (a) put in place measures to ensure the Council's own operations and functions achieve carbon neutrality by 2025; (b) work with partners to aim for all projects and services delivered in the Borough to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030; (c) ensure that the Council's procurement policy recognises carbon neutrality as one of its primary considerations; and (d) recognise the urgency of action to mitigate and adapt to climate change in every decision taken by the Council. This is underpinned by the Climate and Environment Emergency Strategy 2020–2030 and the supporting Climate and Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and 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 plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Local Plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts.

The NPPF aims for the need for housing to be met, and Policy S2 of the Adopted Local Plan sets a target for 14,580 dwellings to be provided by 2036. The NPPF, Policies S1,

DM2 and DM3 of the Adopted 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.

Conclusion:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐

Comments ...