

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/25/99311

Site Address: Meller House, Oakbank Road, Bishopstoke, Eastleigh, SO50 6HF

Case Officer: Gregg Chapman

Description: Conversion of existing site of 21 dwellings to 15 dwellings including alterations to the roof, and extensions/alterations to the building, and associated works including landscaping, private amenity, refuse, cycle store and parking.

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Within Urban Edge Bishopstoke Conservation Area Setting of Listed Buildings Great Crested Newts Red Zone Within Zone of Impact of European protected Solent Complex (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites), River Itchen (SAC and SSSI) and New Forest National Park (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites) Public Right of Way Buffer Archaeological Site of County Importance		

Planning History?	Yes ☐	No ☒
None relevant		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☒
Representations:	4 letters objection from 3 residents; - The development is inappropriate for the Conservation Area, representing a significant increase in occupancy and a change in character, contrary to the low key sheltered use originally intended for the site. - Removal of a characterful brick wall without permission has already harmed the aesthetic of the site, with further development likely to erode the heritage value. - Oakbank Road is a single-track cul-de-sac with no public turning space and heavy pedestrian use. A shift from elderly residents with minimal cars to younger families could result in significant increases in traffic and delivery movements, risking blocked access for emergency and service vehicles. - No parking restrictions at the junction, a stop sign at the Mellor House exit, clear guidance on managing illegal parking, and prevention of parking restrictions north of the junction to avoid overspill onto Church Road are necessary if permission is granted. - Existing sewer infrastructure is inadequate, with sewage backup and flooding during heavy rainfall due to restrictions in the Church Road/Riverside sewer. Additional wastewater from increased occupancy would exacerbate flooding and system failures unless Southern Water undertakes remedial work. - The application lacks details of working practices. Construction risks obstructing Oakbank Road. - The proposed increase in building height has not been specified. - A third party indicates that they hold an inherited legal right to approve changes to Mellor House.		

Parish Council:	Bishopstoke Parish Council Planning Committee decided to object to this planning application on the following grounds; the surface material of the car park, although permeable, may still cause sewage and drainage problems; increased parking at the property means more cars coming onto and turning off of Church Road; Oakbank Road is used regularly by pedestrians to walk to the river and with increased traffic movements this would come with increased risk.
Ecology	Objection (in summary); - Failure to provide a valid biodiversity metric and to demonstrate biodiversity net gain as required by the Environment Act, DM11 and NPPF paragraphs 187d and 192b. - Failure to provide sufficient information to rule out the use of the building by bats as required by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended - Failure to provide sufficient information to demonstrate compliance with the water quality requirements of DM 6 for sites within 100 m of the River Itchen SAC. - Failure to demonstrate that this site, in a red impact risk zone for great crested newts, does not contain suitable habitat for terrestrial great crested newts, a protected species according to standing advice.
Built Heritage	No objection subject to additional information.
HCC Highways	No objection
HCC Local Lead Flood Authority	The applicant has not provided any information on the surface water management proposal/local flood risk and therefore, it is unclear which drainage strategy the applicant is seeking for approval. Bearing in mind that this is an application for full planning permission, we request that the applicant provides additional information on the proposed surface water management within the application site. This should include detail of the entire proposed drainage, calculations and sufficient information to cover each of the points on our checklist.
Trees	No objection
HCC Archaeology	No objection
Southern Water	No objection, subject to conditions.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 24 th June 2025		

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, S2, S3, S8; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM5, DM6, DM7, DM10, DM11, DM12, DM13, DM14, DM23, DM24, DM25, DM29, DM30. Supplementary Planning Documents: Bishopstoke Conservation Area, Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards.

Conservation Area

The site lies within a Conservation Area and Section 71(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

“In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in the Conservation Area of any powers (under the Planning Acts), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area”.

Assessment:**Principle of Development**

The application site is located within the Urban Edge, where the principle of development and redevelopment for residential purposes is acceptable in principle, subject to meeting other relevant planning requirements, in accordance with policy DM23 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016 – 2036 (EBLP).

Policies DM24 and DM25 of the EBLP seek to provide a mix of accommodation, and accommodation for the elderly respectively. The site formerly provided a ‘semi-sheltered’ housing association site for the elderly, but with units sold on the open market, and with there being no planning restrictions. There is, therefore, no requirement for the retention or reprovision of elderly accommodation through policy DM25. Policy DM24 of the EBLP seeks a mix of accommodation which the proposal, which would offer (unchanged) studio layouts through to three bedroom five person family units, would deliver. This is a material benefit of the scheme.

Character and Appearance/Conservation Area/Setting of Listed Buildings

Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulates that all new development should respect the character and appearance of urban areas, take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible in terms of mass, scale, layout density, design, and siting. Policy S8 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) seeks to ensure that proposals conserve and/or enhance the Boroughs heritage assets.

The Bishopstoke Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals document (CAA) explains that the Conservation Area has a layered historic character with large 19th-century houses and mature trees along the River Itchen and Itchen Navigation, with green spaces like Glebe Meadow and the old St Mary’s Church site adding to its verdant character. The area is detailed as having attractive views along rivers and tree-lined roads, though some are impacted by modern surfacing and parked cars. It is also of importance, as set out within the CAA that the area is rich in biodiversity, with the Itchen designated as a Special Area of Conservation, supporting protected wildlife and enhancing its natural riverside character.

Meller House is not of historic value in itself, although it is surrounded by a wall of historic merit, which is a clear heritage asset. The northern most part of the wall at Church Road is identified within the CAA as an ‘Important Wall’. The site is located to the north of the junction with Church Road and Oakbank Road, and therefore has a prominence in the street, and in views from the Recreation Ground to the east, and the old St Mary’s Church site to the south. It is also visible in views from listed buildings including The Old Rectory, Old Rectory Cottage, Itchen House, and the Coach House, providing a setting to these buildings, and when approaching and leaving the footpath network which starts in close proximity to the site to the south west.

The proposals include new fenestration, a new parking area, and ancillary bin/cycle stores, a new eaves form, truncation of an existing extension, and changes to the roof material. The alterations to the building are not in themselves significant and would not cause harm to the character of the area..

Whilst not significant, there is no indication on either the drawings or the application form of wall finish to the truncated front wing. The agent indicates (in writing) that this will match the remainder of the site, but has not provided detailed drawings to this effect. Whilst this level of missing detail is regrettable, it is considered that the necessary level of detail could be secured through condition, if approval had otherwise been recommended, which for the reasons below it has not been.

The alterations to the communal amenity areas are more significant, being changed to private gardens, and with the introduction of the proposed new parking area and cycle and bin stores. The proposal would, through the subdivision of the private space become more intensively used, with associated domestic paraphernalia. This is not considered unusual within the built up area. Not all of the gardens (and the associated paraphernalia) would in any event be visible from the public realm, although some would be prominent in the street. Details of the landscape planting (notwithstanding the submitted details) could be secured through condition if permission were to have been recommended, including to ensure that this provides an appropriate retained screen.

There are listed buildings to the north and south of the site, and whilst there is a degree of intervisibility between them and the site, the proposed alterations and ancillary works would not be of harm to their setting as a result of the separation distance and the proposed scheme.

The proposed development is considered to comply with Policies DM1 and S8 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036) and the Bishopstoke Conservation Area SPD respecting the character of the area and preserving the significance of the Conservation Area.

Highway Matters

Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) requires that development is or could be well served by public transport, cycling and walking and it includes measures which minimise its impact on the existing highway network. Policy DM14 requires that an appropriate level of car parking be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards. The policy provisions are consistent with the requirements of the NPPF and in particular those of paragraphs 107 and 108.

Third parties raise concern regarding the impact of additional residents and family accommodation at the site, with associated concern regarding parking and vehicular manoeuvres.

With regard to the access, the Highway Authority have reviewed the submitted details, and the existing access in and out of the site, which is not proposed to be changed, and have advised that this is acceptable for the proposed development, which would result in an increase of approximately 10 residents. When additional movements associated within only 10 additional residents are spread throughout the day, this would not be a severe impact which the NPPF indicates as the level at which development should be refused.

The proposals involve the removal of an element of the existing building to the eastern side, and this area is to be replaced with vehicle parking, increasing the onsite quantum from the existing 5 spaces to 13. The Highway Authority confirm that in terms of layout, this is acceptable with adequately sized bays, and aisle widths which will enable on-site turns to be undertaken to enable forward gear access and egress.

The proposal is for the reduction in the number of units from 21 to 15, but an increase in the number of parking spaces from 5 to 13. This is an improvement from 0.23 spaces per unit to 0.87 spaces per unit. The Residential Parking Standards SPD advises that 1 space per dwelling is required for a one bed property (where 50% or more unallocated spaces) and 1.5 space per 2/3 bed dwelling (where 50% or more unallocated spaces). The existing flatted development parking standard would therefore be 22 spaces (there is one two bed unit with all others being one bed) where there are 5 (22.7% of standard).

The proposed scheme for 15 units provides a standard of 18.5 spaces (eight one bed units and seven two or three bed units).

	Number of Units	Parking Standard	Actual Provision	Difference from Standard
Current Circumstance	21	21	5	-16 (22.7% provision)
Proposal	15	18.5	13	- 5.5 (70.3% provision)

The proposal reduces the number of units and increases parking provision, improving compliance with standards from 22.7% to 70.3% and significantly reducing the parking shortfall on site.

Should permission have been recommended, conditions requiring the access layout to be retained together with visibility splays, and the provision and retention of parking spaces, would be imposed. This can ensure compliance with policies DM13 and DM14 of the EBLP.

- Construction

Whilst a certain degree of disruption would be anticipated during construction, this could be effectively managed through a Construction Environmental Management Plan, requiring details of site storage and construction parking and vehicle manoeuvring. Such a condition is recommended by the Highway Authority. However, the application is recommended for refusal.

Ecology

Policy DM11 of the EBLP requires planning applications, to protect, conserve and enhance all international, national and local nature conservation designations; and networks of natural habitats and features, including the Local Ecological Network, Priority Biodiversity Areas and Priority Biodiversity Links, watercourses, wetland complexes, woodland trees, and trees and hedgerows important to biodiversity and local character; and facilitate their adaptation to climate change wherever possible; and seek a net gain of biodiversity on all development sites.

Circular 06/2005 (ODPM) and the standing advice of Natural England and the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (updated September 2022) advise that the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a development proposal is being considered which would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. As such, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent to which they may be affected by a proposal is established before planning permission is granted.

Paragraph 99 of the ODPM circular advises that developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by the development

- Site Sensitivity

This area of Bishopstoke has considerable biodiversity value in terms of the Itchen Navigation and the River Itchen. These both have European, national, regional and local levels of protection. At European level, the River Itchen forms a Special Area of Conservation (SAC). It is also a nationally designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), part of a regional Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) and contains features identified as being of local importance in a local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).

- Bats

Due to its location along the River and Navigation, this part of Bishopstoke has a very large population of bats, which receive European and national designations for protection. Due to the proximity of the Itchen and the Navigation, and the wide range of trees to serve as roosts, it is likely that buildings of all ages in the conservation area will have bat colonies.

The proposal involves alterations to the existing (demolition of part of the building, a change in roof tile, and the installation of rafter toes to allow for internal guttering to be moved externally, and an eaves overhang to be created).

The Council Ecologist has identified that the roof has opportunities to accommodate bats. A preliminary bat roost appraisal, including internal inspection, is required to assess any potential impact on bat populations, in line with standing advice from Natural England and the ODPM circular. No ecological information has been provided regarding the potential for the site to support bats, a protected species. This was requested but the applicant has declined to provide this information.

- Great Crested Newts

The site is also within an area identified as a red zone (the most important) for Great Crested Newts (GCN), with a nearby record of a GCN within this zone, to the south. There is a large pond to the south and three ponds to the north.

Natural England standing advice for GCN is that a survey should be requested if there are records of GCN within the locality, there are suitable water bodies within 500m of the development (even if it only holds water for part of the year), or the development includes refuges such as logs, rubble, grass, scrub. Only one of these criteria need be met to trigger the requirement for survey work. All three are met. An Ecological Report was subsequently submitted. This raised that the proposed works are likely to cause an offence with regard to GCN, but identified the district level licencing scheme (DLL) as suitable mitigation, or that survey work could be carried out. The applicant has indicated an intention to engage with the DLL. The DLL is designed to assess impact and mitigate any harm, thus removes the need for applicants/developers to undertake their own great crested newt surveys

The standing advice given by Natural England for how to join their great crested newt district level licencing scheme, advises that a developer/applicant must include a copy of the countersigned Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate (IACPC) with the planning application to show they have agreed to join the scheme. Natural England will send the developer/applicant an IACPC once they have received the application form and details; assessed the effect of the proposal on great crested newts and the cost of dealing with the impact through new or improved ponds for great crested newts. In this instance Nature Space provide the DLL, not Natural England. The Standing Advice of Natural England does not therefore apply. It is, however, apparent that Nature Space provide the same certification procedure.

The Applicant has not formally engaged with the Nature Space certification procedure and so the impact of the proposal on great crested newts and any necessary mitigation has not been demonstrated.

This means that all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed prior to determining an application for planning permission. This is not something that could reasonably be dealt with by the imposition of conditions.

- Summary (Protected Species)

Natural England's Standing Advice for protected species stipulates that a developer should submit enough information to enable the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully consider the effect on protected species and their habitats and that surveys can be requested where there is suitable habitat on site. In this case, no ecological supporting

details have been provided with regard to bats. An Ecological Report has been submitted with regard to great crested newts and identifies that the development would likely cause an offence. Further survey work has not been carried out, and a DLL has not been engaged with.

Insufficient information has been submitted to allow the LPA to fully consider the ecological effects of the proposals as required under the Habitat Regulations. This is not a matter that can be conditioned. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the requirements of Policy DM11 of the Local Plan and Paragraphs 187 and 193 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021).

Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met ("the biodiversity gain condition"). This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat. This increase can be achieved through onsite biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.

The applicant has submitted a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) metric. This shows a 12.67% enhancement in habitat units and a 307.43% increase in hedgerow units.

The Council's Ecologist has reviewed the submitted BNG information and identified several deficiencies. The Metric fails national validation requirements and contains three additional metric errors, including missing dated photographs for baseline habitats, inconsistencies between areas of habitat lost and created, and discrepancies between the baseline habitat area and the total site area.

The metric relies on a single photograph of a vegetated garden which no longer exists on site, as the area has been cleared and a drainage trench dug. This represents unauthorised degradation of the site and undermines the accuracy of the baseline assessment.

It is also evident that there are insufficient details with regard to the proposed planting. Without full details of all trees and shrubs to be removed, together with full details and precise locations of any new planting it is not possible to assess whether such measures would deliver biodiversity gains.

The absence of robust supporting information means it is not possible to have confidence that the requisite biodiversity net gain could be achieved either on site or off site.

National Planning Practice Guidance advises that it would generally be inappropriate to refuse an application on the basis that the biodiversity gain objective may not be met. However, in this case, the deficiencies in the submission are such that they do not demonstrate compliance with the statutory requirement. It would not be appropriate to defer this matter to a later stage by condition. Accordingly, the development does not comply with Schedules 7A and 14 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and the Environment Act 2021.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policies DM3 and DM6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) stipulate that new development must provide sustainable drainage systems (SuDs) wherever feasible, naturalised filtration should also be included.

The application proposes additional hard standing (car parking area, and bike and bin store, and it is realistic to presume that residents with new gardens would look to install patios/sheds in future).

The applicant has indicated that the SUDS strategy is for linear slot drain and the use of a 3.6m³ soakaway under the car park with geomembrane over and 400mm compacted fill.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the submitted drainage information and advises that the soakaway calculations rely on a simplified method which assumes high infiltration rates and is not acceptable. They require on-site infiltration testing and groundwater monitoring to demonstrate the suitability of the proposed approach (this was requested from the applicant but not provided).

LLFA also advise that, in addition, no evidence regarding the adequacy or capacity of the existing site drainage. Given the age of the existing development and the likelihood of low permeability soils in Bishopstoke, it is unlikely that the existing surface water drainage arrangements are capable of managing surface water runoff to modern standards.

Without necessary information, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the development will not result in increased flood risk, contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies S1, DM3, DM5 and DM6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016 – 2036.

The inadequacy of the submitted drainage strategy is of additional concern given the proximity to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI, and the potential risks from pollutants and sediments during the construction and operation phases.

SPA Mitigation

The application proposes a decrease in the number of units of overnight accommodation, and therefore would not have a significant effect on protected sites.

Residential Amenity

- Living Standards

The existing accommodation is indicated as being formed by one 17m² visitor bedroom, two 1 bed flats and one 2 bed manager flat, and a total of seventeen bedsits of approximately 30m² each.

The submission explains that the scheme will not include alteration to the floor plans of four studios, and the two 1bed units (six units in total). The remaining units would be amalgamated to create four new 1 bed units, four new 2 bed units, and three new three bedroom units. There would, consequently, be an overall decrease in the number of units at the site.

The communal garden areas would be revised to provide private gardens for ten of the fifteen dwellings. Four dwellings would not, therefore, have access to garden space (private or communal).

Whilst the number of units is proposed to decrease, overall, the number of residents within the existing building, would have equated to 26, but the revised proposals would accommodate 34 people. This is a 31% increase in occupancy/bedspaces.

The below table considers the proposed altered unit sizes against the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).

Unit	Proposal	Proposed Size (sqm)	NDSS (sqm)
3	2b3p (2 floors)	77	70

4	3b5p (2 floors)	122	93
6	1b2p	55	50
7	2b3p (2 floors)	70	70
8	2b3p (2 floors)	70	70
9	2b3p (2 floors)	70	70
10	3b5p (2 floors)	95.6	93
11	3b4p (2 floors)	84	84
14	1b2p	55	50

All of the single bedrooms are larger than the advised 7.5 sqm, but five of the double bedrooms (units 7-11) are smaller than the required 11.5 sqm for double occupancy (the smallest being 9.5 sqm and the largest 10.6 sqm). This is not considered to be preferable, but given that the building is an existing building, therefore with constraints, and that the proposed overall property sizes meet standards thereby providing space elsewhere within the properties, this could be accepted, on balance, and would provide adequate living standards, that residents would be buying into. It may reduce occupation numbers marginally. It is also relevant that the units being amalgamated are currently under the relevant NDSS in their overall, not providing sufficient space, and therefore, their loss is considered acceptable so as to provide an appropriate standard of home (albeit with some marginally undersized double bedrooms).

It is considered to be a benefit of the scheme that the proposal would result in an increase in bedspaces overall, and that it would deliver seven family (2 and 3 bed) homes, in place of the substandard sized studio units that would be amalgamated.

In terms of garden provision, the Quality Places SPD sets out that;

*“For flats, private amenity space of *3 square metres per unit or *2 square metres per bedroom (whichever is the greater) will be required. This figure may be subtracted from the minimum amount of communal space provided for these dwellings. (*at least)”*

“For houses, the absolute minimum for private amenity space of at least 60% of the floor space will be required. This minimum may be reduced in urban areas when the dwelling is within 100m (by safe and convenient route) of a public open space”

10 small gardens are proposed. These are not significant in size, and in some instances less than 60% of the footprint where they would serve houses. However, this is an improvement over the existing situation where no private gardens exist. The units that would not be provided with gardens include three upstairs units (12,13 and 15) which are part of the existing layout and are not proposed to change, and two one bedroom flats. The existing flats would lose their access to communal space, but have access to the large recreation ground opposite. The proposed two new flats (6 and 14) would not have any private amenity space, but replace units that currently do not have. Again, they would have access to the large recreation ground where policy advice is that the required 3 sqm can be reduced.

The standard of living accommodation is, therefore, broadly in compliance with policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 and the Quality Places SPD, providing an enhancement from the existing studio units.

Other Matters

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.

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 and Planning Balance

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and, therefore, paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged. This requires planning permission to be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate a clear reason for refusal.

Footnote 7 confirms that such restrictive policies include those relating to habitat sites, SSSIs, irreplaceable habitats, designated heritage assets, and areas at risk of flooding.

The proposal would deliver a number of benefits, including refurbishment of an existing site, provision of a better mix of accommodation, replacement of substandard studio units with larger family dwellings, an uplift in overall occupancy numbers, and a significant improvement in on-site parking provision. These factors weigh in favour of the development.

However, the application fails to provide sufficient ecological information to assess the impact on protected species, does not demonstrate compliance with the statutory requirement for biodiversity net gain, and lacks an acceptable surface water drainage strategy. These deficiencies are fundamental, particularly given the site's proximity to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI, and cannot be remedied by the use of conditions. They conflict with both the development plan and the requirements of national policy.

In these circumstances, the restrictive policies of the NPPF relating to biodiversity and flood risk apply, displacing the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Even if the tilted balance were engaged, the harms identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme.

Accordingly, the application is recommended for refusal.

Conclusion:		
Recommendation:	PERMIT ☐	REFUSE ☒
Comments ...		