

2352 - CHICKENHALL LANE - CONSULTATION RESPONSES SCHEDULE

Version 1 - 23rd May 2025 - JB

Application ref: F/24/98678

Construction of a 70-bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated parking, landscaping, access, drainage, and other associated works following demolition of existing structures.



DATE	CONSULTEE	COMMENT SUMMARY & KEY ISSUES RAISED		HIGHWOOD RESPONSE
09/01/2025	SGN / SSE / Utilites Search	Utilities letters, advice, guidance and maps provided for Gas, Electricity and other assets. Take note for construction.		Noted
15/01/2025	EBC Heritage	No objection.		Noted
16/01/2025	EBC Environmental Health Ground Contamination	No objection - subject to conditions and amendment to the submitted CEMP to reflect the fact that we are demolishing structures subject to Asbestos Regulations.		See amended CEMP submitted to EBC 23rd May 2025
16/01/2025 and 13/03/2025	Southern Water	1. Holding response - requested more time until 6th February for response. 2. March response - There is currently adequate capacity in the local sewerage network to accommodate a foul flow of 0.304 l/s for the above development at manhole reference SU46191102. Please note that no surface water flows (existing or proposed) can be accommodated within the existing foul sewerage system unless agreed by the Lead Local Flood Authority in consultation with Southern Water, after the hierarchy Part H3 of Building Regulations has been complied with. Water supply can be provided. Sewers - Once the location of the existing sewer is finalised, Southern Water will require a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. SUDS - No soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of public or adoptable gravity sewers, rising mains or water mains.		Noted. We are liaising with SWS on easement requirements and necessary consents will be sought in due course. Note that the LLFA and EA do not object to proposals.
20/01/2025	EBC Environmental Health Noise	No objections subject to the acoustic report Dice Environmental be referenced in any approval.		Noted. Also see the Noise Impact Assessment Addendum prepared by DICE and submitted on 23rd May 2025, which addresses a subsequent query raised regarding noise effects arising from the consent of a nearby Material Recycling Facility scheme.
21/01/2025	EBC Urban Design	Object. Outside the urban edge in countryside and settlement gap. Presumption against new development. Further detailed comments on layout and design, bulk and mass provided - with actions needed should the principle of development be accepted. Comments on sustainability also provided.		See updated Landscape Visual Statement Rev A prepared by Deacon Design which addresses landscape and Gap issues and the Harris Irwin Technical Note on the orientation/shadowing/amenity comments submitted on 23rd May 2025. We have addressed technical queries raised by consultees. The layout, design, scale, and appearance of the building is appropriate to the site and surrounding context. See response to DRP below. This is a sustainable location for the proposals which addresses a currently unmet need, and the significant benefits outweigh the harms as set out in the submitted Planning Design and Access Statement.
22/01/2025	Natural England	Further information required to inform HRA.		See Shadown HRA prepared by FPCR submitted on 23rd May 2025. Mitigation measures on nutrients, impacts on other designations etc can be dealt with by Section 106 or condition.
27/01/2025 and 07/04/2025	Environment Agency	Initial Objection. Need to take account of climate change allowances. Second Response: No objection, subject to condition on mitigation measures in the FRA/DTN TN03, FFL no lower than 11.60 AOD		See the Jubb Technical Note - TN03 v2 as issued on 18 March which dealt with the initial comments of the LLFA and the EA as well as those raised by EBC on Ecology.
27/01/2025	Southampton Airport	Holding objection - pending further review.		We await further response. A bird hazard management plan could be subject to condition if considered necessary, relevant and reasonable.

2352 - CHICKENHALL LANE - CONSULTATION RESPONSES SCHEDULE

Version 1 - 23rd May 2025 - JB

Application ref: F/24/98678

Construction of a 70-bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated parking, landscaping, access, drainage, and other associated works following demolition of existing structures.



DATE	CONSULTEE	COMMENT SUMMARY & KEY ISSUES RAISED		HIGHWOOD RESPONSE
31/01/2025	EBC Environmental Health Air Quality	In summary, the current assessment appears inconclusive and requires further improvements, particularly in: - Assessing road traffic impacts due to proximity to AQMA 1. - Considering dust sources from the nearby industrial estate. - Recommending an effective ventilation system for future residents. - Addressing dust impact of the construction phase through addition site-specific air quality measures to CEMP.		DICE have been in liason with EBC Env. Health and our response to comments is contained within Version 3 of the Air Quality Assessment, submitted on 23rd May 2025.
03/02/2025 and 02/04/2025	HCC Highways	Initial Response: no objection to the proposals from a highway perspective, subject to confirmation from EBC as Local Planning Authority that they have no issues with potential land take from the site for highway improvement works, and the application of conditions as outlined in the consultation response. Second Response: In terms of the traffic impacts from the Material Waste Centre, no mention of this is made within the supporting TS. It was agreed that given the low level of additional vehicle movements that the care home will bring, such an assessment, and indeed associated junction modelling was not required in this specific case. Whilst the MWC will have an impact to some extent on vehicle flows through the adjacent highway junctions, the added vehicle trip increase from the care home will be negligible and not in itself a concern. It is of course the impacts of the Care Home application that is being assessed, not the MWC.		See plan 024.0060-006-P02 'Proposed Bishopstoke Road Upgrade with Land Requirement' which shows the small area of land required by HCC to deliver Bishopstoke Road improvement scheme. This can be safeguarded through condition/s106 (or transferred to HCC by separate agreement) if necessary. See letter from PBA dated 1st April 2025 in relation to the recently consented material waste facility.
04/02/2025 and 01/04/2025	HCC Lead Local Flood Authority	Initial Response 04/02/25: Object. Issues to be resolved: - Discharge rate of 5l/s exceeds maximum of 2 l/s - Clarification of hydrobrake operation in high flow / flood conditions - Groundwater levels have been identified and may affect the permeable paving unless it is tanked or lined. This doesn't appear to have been considered and would need to take into account utility corridors to ensure its integrity is not compromised. - Cover levels across the site have been identified as 11.45mAOD which does not take into account any existing falls across the area or the exceedance routing identified. Further details should be provided. Updated Response 01/04/25: Updated information addresses the points and on that basis, no objection to the application.		See the Jubb Technical Note - TN03 v2 as issued on 18 March which dealt with the initial comments of the LLFA and the EA as well as those raised by EBC on Ecology.
05/02/2025	EBC Ecology	Object. On the grounds of layout, proximity and lack of a suitable buffer to the River Itchen SAC. In addition, the SuDs strategy does not meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy DM 6. The application would fail a Habitats Regulations Assessment due to impacts on the SAC.		See Shadown HRA prepared by FPCR submitted on 23rd May 2025. Mitigation measures etc can be dealt with by Section 106 or condition. Ecology comments also addressed by Jubb response.
06/02/2025	EBC Tree Officer	The principle arboricultural feature of the site (and extending beyond the red-line boundary) is the mature tree line that sits on the periphery of the site to the west of the Barton River. It appears that this tree-line was more significant prior to submission of this application, with evidence that a significant group of polar trees has been removed. It appears that these trees were significant in the landscape and provided high levels of amenity, but would have been problematic for the proposed layout. We disapprove of this approach, where no justification has been provided. Further, pre-emptive site clearance has ramification for Biodiversity Net Gain calculations. Please can we request some clarity from the applicant regarding these removed trees?		See email response of Martin Hawthorne of Highwood to Rebecca Altman at EBC of 12th March 2025.
14/02/2025	EBC Planning Policy	Summary: contrary to adopted Local Plan policies S5 and S6 and would not constitute plan-led development. To meet the overall level of housing need in the borough, the Local Plan Review is likely to include greenfield sites and strategic allocations where the Council would support development in the countryside. The adopted Local Plan policy DM25 seeks to deliver a mix of housing including older persons accommodation on suitable sites. It is recognised that there is a continuing need for older persons accommodation in the borough. However, no decisions have been made at this early stage about appropriate development sites and therefore the principle of residential development on this site remains contrary to adopted Local Plan policies.		Noted. See submitted Planning Design and Access Statement for our policy rationale for the sustainable development proposed. The signficiant benefits of development outweigh the policy harms to deliver unmet needs.
06/03/2025	Eastleigh Town Council	Objection: contrary to the current Local Plan, raises flood risk concerns highlighted by the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), and could have an impact on local ecology. Additionally, the council is concerned that noise disruption from HGV movements associated with the forthcoming Material Recycling Facility, along with potential odours from the digester at the facility, would significantly affect the quality of life for residents of the care home.		Noted. See above our policy rationale for sustainable development in this location. The EA and LLFA raise no objections to the proposals. We have addressed Ecology, Highways and Env. Health matters in our responses (or pending responses in the case of air quality) and in relation to the material recycling facility.

2352 - CHICKENHALL LANE - CONSULTATION RESPONSES SCHEDULE

Version 1 - 23rd May 2025 - JB

Application ref: F/24/98678

Construction of a 70-bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated parking, landscaping, access, drainage, and other associated works following demolition of existing structures.



DATE	CONSULTEE	COMMENT SUMMARY & KEY ISSUES RAISED		HIGHWOOD RESPONSE
No date	Bishopstoke Parish Council	Bishopstoke Parish Council raises no objection to this planning application. However, they would like to comment that it is not in an ideal position, there will be an impact on the amount of traffic using the road and there is an impact to residents of the care home and residents of the surrounding area from increased noise and pollution.		Noted.
11/03/2025	Design Review Panel	Comments on: - Landscape Impact - Layout, Scale, Mass and Form - Appearance and Context - Amenity Conclusion: Whilst it was acknowledged that the site is in a sustainable location close to Eastleigh Town Centre, it was questioned whether developing the site is appropriate. Chickenhall Lane provides a clear demarcation between the built edge of Eastleigh to the west and the river valley to the east. By developing this site, particularly with a building of the scale and height proposed, this clear edge would be lost. Notwithstanding, if the site is to be developed and the integrity of the settlement gap eroded, it needs to be by a high quality scheme which enhances the locality and picks up on the best of the local context. However, that presented does not achieve this and requires significant reworking, particularly in terms of form, scale, mass and elevational composition as well as further work on developing a landscape strategy which both softens the visual impact upon the locality, as well as creating an appropriate setting for the development.		See updated Landscape Visual Statement Rev A prepared by Deacon Design which addresses landscape and Gap issues and the Harris Irwin Technical Note on the orientation/shadowing/amenity comments submitted on 23rd May 2025. Following the comments raised at the Design Review Panel we have explored various design alternatives for the building parapet, as shown in the CGI options. The 4th option as chosen, and reflected in the revised elevations, we feel maintains the strength of the main building form evident in the elevations whilst providing a softer and crisper edge to the predominant parapet line. This will be achieved through the use of a thin metal capping to this parapet top which contrasts with, and is visually subservient to, the treatment of that on the protruding building elements. These remain with the previous capping detail which is deeper and will create a small shadow gap on these forms, drawing the eye to this edge and helping to differentiate with the parapet behind. This helps to articulate the care home and brings another level of hierarchy to the reading of the building and the various forms. Functionally this retains the primary parapet height and allows that the plant and any PV panels on the roof to be maintained in safety without the need for railings or mansafe systems. On landscape, additional planting has been provided north and northeast of the site (as much as possible achievable given the underground easement constraints at the site), which will further strengthen the already substantial screening of the site when viewed from the north/northeast/east. We have addressed technical queries raised by consultees. The layout, design, scale, and appearance of the building is appropriate to the site and surrounding context. This is a sustainable location for the proposals which addresses a currently unmet need, and the significant benefits outweigh the harms as set out in the submitted Planning Design and Access Statement.

2352 - CHICKENHALL LANE - CONSULTATION RESPONSES SCHEDULE

Version 1 - 23rd May 2025 - JB

Application ref: F/24/98678

Construction of a 70-bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated parking, landscaping, access, drainage, and other associated works following demolition of existing structures.



DATE	CONSULTEE	COMMENT SUMMARY & KEY ISSUES RAISED		HIGHWOOD RESPONSE
25/04/2025	EBC Case Officer (DM)	[Without prejudice] Listed below is the information due to be submitted: - Further landscape and visual impact information; - Further information regarding shading of north facing rooms and amenity space; - Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA); - Updated Air Quality Assessment (to include consideration of impact of Material Recycling Facility); - Update to Noise Assessment to include consideration of impact of Material Recycling Facility; - Overlay plan showing future highway works against proposed layout; - Update to landscape plan to show further tree planting in north-west corner; - Response to Design Review Panel comments.		This information is submitted 23rd May 2025.