

Eastleigh Local Area Committee (ELAC)

DATE: 4th November 2025

Application Number: F/24/98678
Case Officer: Gary Osmond
Received Date: 24 December 2024
Site Address: Land east of Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh, SO50 6AF
Applicant: Highwood Ventures 7 Limited
Proposal: 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.

Recommendation: PERMIT subject to completion of a signed S106 agreement which secures: i) planning obligations towards sustainable transport measures and public art; ii) biodiversity net gain; and iii) transfer of land to the Highway Authority and the following conditions:

CONDITIONS

1) Implementation timeframe

The development hereby permitted shall start no later than three years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) Approved plans

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

- 0101 P5 – Site Location Plan
- 0102 P22 – Proposed Site Plan
- 0201 P11 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan
- 0211 P11 – Proposed First Floor Plan
- 0221 P11 – Proposed Second Floor Plan
- 2701 P2 – General Arrangement Roof Plan
- 0301 P9 – Proposed Elevations – Sheet 1
- 0302 P9 – Proposed Elevations – Sheet 2
- 9005 P1 – Proposed Demolition Plan
- 9006 P1 – Proposed Bike Store
- 9007 P1 – Refuse and Sub Station
- 9008 P2 – Proposed Garden Building
- 0403 P3 - Proposed Site Sections
- DD679L01 G – Landscape General Arrangement Plan

- Proposed River Barton Buffer Zone plan

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

3) Habitats regulations

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced for a period of at least 21 days from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with Section 281 (6) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) as this permission is being granted otherwise than in accordance with the advice of Natural England.

4) Contaminated land remedial scheme

No works shall commence on site until a detailed site-specific scheme for remedial works and measures to be undertaken to avoid the risk from contaminants and/or gases when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring has been submitted to and approved by the LPA, in accordance with the agreed Ground Conditions Assessment Report (Ground Conditions Consultants, October 2024, Version 2.0. Report reference J24-018-R03). Such a scheme shall include nomination of a competent person to oversee the implementation of the works.

Reason: To minimise the risk from land contamination for the safety of the future occupiers/ users of the development, in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

5) Contaminated land verification

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied / brought into use until there has been submitted to the LPA verification by the competent person approved under the provisions of condition 3 above (remediation) that any remediation scheme required and approved under the provisions of condition 3 has been implemented fully in accordance with the approved details (unless varied with the written permission of the LPA in advance of implementation). Unless agreed in writing with the LPA such verification shall comply with UK Land contamination risk management (LCRM). Typically such a report would comprise:

- a. A description of the site and its background, and summary of relevant site information;
- b. a description of the remediation objectives and remedial works carried out;
- c. verification data, including - data (sample locations/analytical results, as-built drawings of the implemented scheme, photographs of the remediation work in progress, etc.
- d. Certificates demonstrating that imported and/or material left in situ is free from contamination, confirmation of material removal, gas/vapour membranes have been installed correctly.

Thereafter the scheme shall be monitored and maintained in accordance with the scheme approved under condition above (remediation)

Reason: To minimise the risk from land contamination for the safety of the future occupiers/ users of the development in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

6) Construction Environmental Management Plan

The construction of the development shall take place in accordance with the details and methodologies set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan Version 5 (Highwood Construction, 2025), or in accordance with alternative details that shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority through formal condition submission.

Reason: To limit the impact the development has on the amenity of the locality and to protect biodiversity, in accordance with Policies DM1, DM8 and DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036.

7) Tree protection

The development must accord with the Arboricultural Method Statement reference JFA0340 V3. No excavation, demolition or development related works shall commence until the tree protection measures have been installed as per the tree protection plan contained within the report. Once installed, no access by vehicles or placement of goods, chemicals, fuels, soil or other materials shall take place within the protected area. Tree protection measures shall be retained in their approved form for the duration of the work and may only be modified subject to written agreement from the LPA.

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

8) Access provision

No development shall start on site until the access, including the footway, shall be constructed and lines of sight provided in accordance with the approved plans. The lines of sight splays shown on the approved plans shall be kept free of any obstruction exceeding 1m in height above the adjacent carriageway and shall be subsequently maintained so thereafter.

Reason: To provide satisfactory access and in the interest of highway safety, in accordance with Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

9) Parking provision

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, provision for parking shall have been made in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To ensure adequate on-site car parking provision for the development and in the interest of highway safety in accordance with Policy DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local plan (2016-2036).

10) Materials

Prior to any development above foundation / slab level, full details of the proposed external materials for the development, including facing and roofing materials, window, parapet, balcony and rainwater goods details and hard surfacing, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a high quality design in the interest of visual amenity, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

11) Drainage strategy provision and maintenance

The drainage scheme shall be installed and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the details and associated plans set out in the Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy Report (Jubb, November 2024, ref. 24305_FRA01) and the Technical Note V3 (Jubb, 16.03.2025).

Reason: To ensure suitable drainage to prevent flood risk and pollution to watercourses, in accordance with Policies DM5 and DM6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

12) Finished floor levels

The finished floor levels of the development shall be set no lower than 11.60.AODm above Ordnance Datum (AOD) as stated in section 2.1.1 of the Technical Note V3 (Jubb, 16.03.2025), and shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants, in accordance with Policy DM5 of the Eastleigh Local Plan (2016-2036).

13) Ecological mitigation

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the ecological and protected species mitigation measures set out in the submitted Ecological Impact Appraisal (FPCR Environment & Design, dated June 2025).

Reason: To ensure that protected species are not harmed by the development and to achieve biodiversity enhancements in accordance with Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

14) Lighting

The external lighting scheme for the development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the details set out in the submitted Artificial Lighting Assessment Version 3 (Dice Environmental, 9 December 2024, ref. 101358), or in accordance with alternative details that shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority through formal condition submission.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to avoid harm to protected species, in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

15) Boundary treatment

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, no development above foundation / slab level shall take place until full details of all boundary treatments and enclosures, to include details of the substation enclosure, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boundary treatment shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details.

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

16) Roof mounted plant and equipment

Prior to any development above foundation / slab level, details of any roof mounted plant and equipment including solar PV panels, and details of any barriers and enclosures, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plant and equipment shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details.

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

17) Landscaping

- a) The landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with Landscape General Arrangement Plan 'DD679L01 REV G', and in accordance with detailed planting plans to 1:200 scale that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- b) The landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season following occupation of the development, or completion of the development (whichever is sooner), unless an alternative timetable is first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- c) If, within a period of 10 years after planting, any tree or plant is removed, dies or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged, defective or diseased, another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally approved shall be planted at the same place within the next planting season, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

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

18) Refuse and recycling

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans and retained for such purposes thereafter.

Reason: To ensure suitable refuse storage in the interest of amenity, in accordance with Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

19) Cycle storage provision

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the cycle storage facilities for staff and visitors shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter.

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

20) Travel Plan implementation

Measures to encourage sustainable travel shall be implemented in accordance with the details set out in the Travel Plan prepared by Paul Basham Associates dated December 2024 (ref. 024.0060/TP/3).

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

21) Noise mitigation

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the noise mitigation measures set out in the Noise Impact Assessment Version 5 (Dice Environmental, 9th December 2024, ref. 101358) and the Noise Impact Assessment Addendum Version 3 (Dice Environmental, 17th June 2025, ref. 101358).

Reason: To ensure that future occupants will be protected from adverse noise impacts in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Eastleigh Local Plan (2016-2036).

22) Noise mitigation verification

Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a post-completion acoustic assessment shall be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant. The assessment shall demonstrate that the internal noise levels within habitable rooms and external amenity areas meet the criteria set out in the Noise Impact Assessment Version 5 (Dice Environmental, 9th December 2024, ref. 101358) and the Noise Impact Assessment Addendum Version 3 (Dice Environmental, 17th June 2025, ref. 101358).

Reason: To ensure that future occupants will be protected from adverse noise impacts in accordance with Policy DM8 of the Eastleigh Local Plan (2016-2036).

23) BREEAM

Within 3 months following occupation of the care home, a report demonstrating how the development meets the relevant BREEAM requirements including a New Construction Post Construction certificate at 'Excellent' standard, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development meets required sustainability standards in accordance with Policy DM2 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

24) Electric vehicle charging

The development shall not be occupied until electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure has been installed in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details must include:

- Total number, type, location and operation of EV charging points;
- Passive provision for future EV charging;
- A timeline for installation and maintenance.

Reason: To promote sustainable travel to reduce air pollution and support climate change mitigation, in accordance with Policies DM3 and DM8 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

25) Bird Hazard Management Plan

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the Bird Hazard Management Plan (FPCR, November 2024).

Reason: To reduce the risk to birds due to the close proximity to Southampton Airport.

26) Nutrient mitigation

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a mitigation package addressing the additional nutrient inputs arising from

the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Such a mitigation package shall address all of the additional nutrient loading upon protected European sites from the development and shall allow the Local Planning Authority to ascertain on the basis of the best available scientific evidence that such additional nutrient loading will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of those European Sites, having regard to the conservation objectives for they are designated. The mitigation package shall be implemented in full and evidence of this provided to the Local Planning Authority in writing prior to first occupation of the development.

Reason: To mitigate the nutrient impacts arising from the development upon the European protected Solent Complex in accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016 – 2036).

Conditions to comply with the Environment Act 2021

27) BNG management and monitoring

On-site habitat shall be created, managed and monitored in accordance with the details set out in the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan V.01 (FPCR, 29/09/2025), unless any amendments are first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include monitoring of habitats for a 30 year period, with monitoring reports submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in years 2, 3, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30.

Reason: To ensure delivery of at least 10% biodiversity net gain as required by the Environment Act (2021) and to comply with policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

28) BNG verification

Notice in writing shall be given to the Local Planning Authority when the:

- a) Habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan V.01 (FPCR, 20/09/2025), have commenced, and;
- b) Habitat creation and enhancement works as set out in the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan V.01 (FPCR, 20/09/2025), have been completed.

Reason: To ensure delivery of at least 10% biodiversity net gain as required by the Environment Act (2021) and to comply with policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Note to applicant: The access works will require a separate S278 Legal Agreement to be entered into. Details can be found via the following link: [Section 278 agreement | Transport and roads | Hampshire County Council](#)

Note to applicant: Given the nature of the proposed development, it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. Please note the requirement within the British Standard Code of Best Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4 – Cranes.

Note to applicant: Southern Water will require a formal application for connection and on-site mains to be made by the developer. This can be made via Southern Water's online Get Connected service at: [Home](#)

Report:

This application has been referred to Committee because it has been called in by the committee chairman.

Site Characteristics and Character of the Locality

1. The site lies in a corner location to the south of Bishopstoke Road and east of Chickenhall Lane. The site comprises mainly open grassland with hedgerows and trees along the eastern, northern and western boundaries. There are some single-storey buildings on the site which are understood to be vacant, and there is gated access from Chickenhall Lane.
2. Beyond the vegetation to the east is the River Barton, which is a tributary of the River Itchen, and beyond that is an outdoor learning centre. To the immediate south is an open field. Bishopstoke Road to the north is a B class road (B3037) which runs between Eastleigh, Bishopstoke and Fair Oak, and Chickenhall Lane provides access to a large industrial estate which extends to the west and south of the site. There is a mini-roundabout at the junction of Bishopstoke Road and Chickenhall Lane and to the north of this is a 5-storey office building. To the north-east of the site is the Bishopstoke Road playing fields. In the wider area there is a public footpath to the east (Eastleigh Town No.49), and locally listed buildings on Barton Road to the west, beyond the industrial buildings.
3. The site lies within the countryside and settlement gap as identified under Policies S5 and S6 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036).

Description of Application

4. Planning permission is sought for the construction of a 70-bed care home on the site. This would comprise an L-shaped building set back from Chickenhall Lane and Bishopstoke Road, with parking on the north

and north-west sides of the site and amenity areas to the east, south and south-west of the building. Access would be from Chickenhall Lane, utilising and extending the existing field access. A new footway would be provided to the north of the access to link to the existing footpath along Bishopstoke Road.

5. The care home would be 3-storeys in height with a flat roof, but with variations in the parapet height, with a maximum height of 10.45m. There would be projecting elements on each side of the building and materials would comprise brickwork and cladding. The main entrance would be located on the west side of the building and along with the care home rooms, internal accommodation would include a café, hair and beauty room, residents lounges and dining rooms, and staff facilities. The care home is designed to cater for residents with a variety of care needs, including those who require dementia care.
6. Along with the main care home building, the plan proposes some ancillary buildings including a substation and refuse store on the north side of the site and a garden building on the east side. The substation and refuse store would be contained within a 2m high fenced enclosure within the car park. The garden building would be located to the east of the care home in an enclosed amenity area, and would be a timber building measuring 3.5m in height, 6.1m in width and 3.2m in depth. Hedgerows are shown to be retained around the western and northern boundary with new landscaping on site to include hedgerows, trees, wildflower grass and shrub planting. Trees on the east side of the site adjacent to the River Barton would be retained and the land abutting the river is proposed to be enhanced for biodiversity.
7. The application is accompanied by the following reports and technical assessments, which can be viewed via the following link: [Planning Application: F/24/98678](#)
 - Noise Impact Assessment (V3, June 2025);
 - Ecological Impact Appraisal (Rev. C, June 2025);
 - BNG Metric (June 2025);
 - Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy Report (V3, June 2025);
 - Air Quality Assessment (V3, May 2025);
 - Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (May 2025);
 - Shadowing Technical Note (April 2025);
 - Landscape and Visual Statement (April 2025);
 - Planning, Design and Access Statement (December 2024);
 - Arboricultural Method Statement (December 2024);
 - Construction Environmental Management Plan (V5);
 - Transport Statement (December 2024);
 - Travel Plan (December 2024);
 - Mineral Resource Assessment (December 2024);
 - Sustainability Statement (December 2024);
 - Artificial Lighting Assessment (December 2024);
 - Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (November 2024);

- Bird Hazard Management Plan (November 2024);
- Nutrient calculator (November 2024);
- Planning Needs Assessment (October 2024);
- Ground Contamination Assessment (October 2024);

Environmental Impact Assessment

8. The proposal would be classed as an 'urban development project' under Column 1, 10b, of the table in Schedule 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017. It would not exceed the thresholds set out in Column 2 of the table (being less than 150 dwellings and less than 5ha in size), but it does lie adjacent to a sensitive area as the adjacent Barton River is designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). A screening opinion has been carried out by the Local Planning Authority, and it has been determined that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated through design and conditions, and that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

Relevant Planning History

9. The only planning history for the site is from the 1970s and 1980s when applications were submitted for a football pitch and ancillary building:
 - Z/18610/001/00 – siting of portacabin adjacent to football pitch for changing facilities – temporary permission 22/04/1988
 - Z/18610/000/00 – football pitch – permitted 27/10/1978

Representations Received

10. Three representations have been received, raising comments and objections on the following grounds:
 - No need for more care homes;
 - Not enough carers to staff the new care home;
 - Accommodation is needed for young people;
 - Insufficient parking provision, resulting in increased risk of people parking in the adjacent industrial site;
 - If the car parking was not restricted to the care home, it could be used by people parking to go into town;
 - Site is unsuitable due to flooding from the river;
 - Increased traffic congestion at the roundabout;
 - Could lead to further housing in the future.

Consultation Responses

11. **Eastleigh Town Council – Objection.**
12. The development is contrary to the current Local Plan, raises flood risk concerns highlighted by the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), and could have an impact on 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.

13. **Bishopstoke Parish Council** – No objection.
14. No objection but would note that it is not an ideal position for a care home. 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.
15. **Planning Policy Officer** - Objection
16. The site is located adjacent to the urban settlement boundary for Eastleigh, within countryside as designated by Policy S5 of the Local Plan. It is also in the settlement gap separating Eastleigh from Bishopstoke, as designated by Policy S6. The proposal is for new residential led development in the countryside, contrary to policies S5 and S6.
17. The Council is at an early stage in the review of the Local Plan. An Issues and Options consultation has taken place, and this reported the sites submitted as part of the call for sites, including this application site. The Council undertook an initial assessment of individual greenfield sites and larger strategic options. The Council will continue to assess sites to consider their suitability, availability and achievability.
18. 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. The principle of this development therefore remains contrary to Local Plan policies.
19. **Landscape Officer** – Objection.
20. The proposed development site is outside the urban edge, being covered by the Local Plan policy map as Countryside and within the Settlement Gap. Views of the ground within the application site are limited in summer by deciduous vegetation, largely restricted to the existing gateway and the view along the Barton River. The visibility increases with height and during the winter. The riverbank tree planting for example is clearly visible across Bishopstoke Recreation Ground to the north, from the Hub to the east and from the Itchen Way to the southeast, from Chickenhall Lane to the south and west, and from Bishopstoke Road. In winter the taller elements around the site are

further exposed being more prominent from the summer locations and visible from further afield.

21. Impact on the Settlement Gap (Policy S6) - The policy has a high threshold for what makes an acceptable development in the gap including both physical and visual impact. There is no argument that the development impacts the gap the discussion is about the type and degree of impact.
22. Extensive evidence within the background work for the Local Plan has been used to review the settlement gap boundaries, ensuring that only land that functions and is necessary is defined as a settlement gap. The proposal site falls within Area F Eastleigh, Bishopstoke Settlement Gap and sits in the narrowest part of the gap. Successive studies have identified the proposal site as providing gap functions which are necessary and valuable for maintaining the separation of Eastleigh and Bishopstoke. The 2020 study specifically identifies the Bishopstoke Road including the proposed site as "the most vulnerable part of the Gap". The proposed development would impact upon the functions the site provides, that support the settlement gap.
23. Impact on the Countryside (Policy S5) – The applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Statement which does not seek to quantify the level of landscape or visual impact but rather a narrative to guide development. It does not follow the standard methodology for assessing landscape impact. What is clear is that the landscape and visual impact is relatively contained, within 1km of the proposed site. However that landscape is valued and appreciated. That has been articulated in the Landscape Character Assessments, the nature conservation and heritage designations, in public access including the National Trail, the Itchen Way. Local winter views are a particular concern with mostly native deciduous planting around this area, the proposed development (especially massing and lighting) will have a greater impact when no leaves are there.
24. Landscape Conclusion – The area along Bishopstoke Road including the application site is highlight as “the most vulnerable” part of the gap, with the priority for enhancements being to reduce urbanising influences. The proposed development would have an unacceptable urbanising effect on the Countryside (Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Policy S5) and the Settlement Gap (Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Policy S6). The proposed development would physically and visually reduce the Eastleigh, Bishopstoke Settlement Gap which is again contrary to Policy S6. The amended site landscape plan is noted but does not alter the overall view on the development proposals.
25. **Urban Design Officer** – Concerns raised.

Comments on amended plans, July 2025

26. The proposal now shows some steps in the roofline of the building. These are not significant changes, but it is felt that the variation works far more successfully when compared with the previous flat roof and continuous parapet. The reduction in eaves line is also welcomed.
27. A CGI has been provided from the roundabout. This is a summer view which relies heavily on existing and new boundary hedge to soften the mass of the proposed building. It shows that only the upper part of the roof of the building would be visible above the boundary hedge. However, during winter months the view will be much more open, and the development would be much more visually prominent. From an urban design perspective, hedgerow should not be relied upon to soften the bulk of a building, given that the maintenance and height of the hedge cannot be controlled.
28. A daylight study was provided to confirm that north facing rooms would have adequate levels of natural daylight.

Further comments, June 2025:

29. Previous concerns raised about the roof form and mass of the building have not been addressed.
30. Concerns about overshadowing of the north facing accommodation and amenity space have also not been addressed. The applicant has argued that operators prefer to have a range of bedroom options available. There is no objection to this provided that all rooms meet minimum recommendations. It is recommended that a sunlight study is provided to show that all habitable rooms are well lit and to provide larger openings on the northern elevation.

Original comments, January 2025:

31. Comments are made on the assumption that suitable justification could be made for a departure from planning policy, given the location in the countryside and settlement gap. Noise is always likely to be a concern due to Chickenhall Lane being the main vehicular entrance to the industrial estate. Question whether the location is appropriate for the use, next to a busy roundabout and two noisy roads.
32. Layout, height and external spaces:
 - Concern about north facing amenity space due to orientation and shading from trees. Request shadow analysis of this area, to also confirm adequate light to north facing rooms.
 - Concern about west facing amenity space due to noise from Chickenhall Lane.
 - Insufficient level of amenity space around the building.
 - The building design should be reconsidered to reduce the number of north facing rooms and balconies.

- Revised scale from 4-storeys (at pre-app stage), to 3-storeys is welcomed, however the design approach with a flat roof with continuous parapet, and a few extruded volumes at a lower level, make it visually bulky with an institutional feeling. The roof form does not make a positive contribution to the appearance of the overall design, or relate sensitively to the context.
 - More opportunities should be sought to break up the mass of the building, e.g. creating separate built forms with recessed and subservient links.
33. Parking:
- Car parking on the northern side of the site is welcomed, but the car park design needs to be landscape led to avoid a public realm dominated by cars and hardstanding.
34. Materials and detailing:
- No objections in principle to the materials palette.
 - Projecting brick coursing detail is important to alleviate blandness, and the dark metal cladding helps to define and make the entrance more legible.
 - However, the visual mass and bulk of the built form needs to be broken up.
35. Sustainability:
- Measures required to help mitigate climate change. To include electric vehicle charging, consideration of renewable technologies, and energy efficiency measures.
36. **Design Review Panel (presented on 11 March 2025)**
37. Landscape Impact:
- Concern about introducing such a large building within the narrowest part of the settlement gap. Existing structures in the gap are of a much smaller scale and height, including the sports pavilion on the north side of Bishopstoke Road. Whilst there is a reasonable level of tree cover along the eastern edge of the site and the southern side of Bishopstoke Road, no evidence was presented to demonstrate that the building would not be visible from further along Bishopstoke Road or the Itchen Way. Considered likely that the roof would be visible above trees from a distance.
 - Little discussion about views from other locations such as the Bishopstoke Road roundabout and Chickenhall Lane. The only natural screening here is the existing boundary hedge, but some of this may need to be removed for future highway improvements, which would open up the whole site to clear views from Bishopstoke Road. Proposals therefore need to include new tree and landscape boundary planting, with gas main easements and other constraints included within a landscape strategy.
38. Layout, scale, mass and form:

- General site layout seems sensible given the site constraints. However, questioned whether the L-shaped footprints needs to be so rigid. The physical scale of the building was a concern, not helped by the unrelieved flat roof form. To address the issue of how the building would be viewed against the skyline, a variation in roof height and form would be recommended or splitting the two wings of the building.
 - Unclear how the layout had taken account of future flooding issues.
39. Appearance and context:
- Unclear why a strong flat roof form had been chosen in this context, where pitched roofs and gables are prevalent. The proposal is of a fairly generic architectural style which does not respond to its surrounding context or the character of the site.
 - The elevations are relatively bland despite the proposed use of brick detailing. Architectural interest needs to come from building form rather than purely the detail applied to it. Questioned whether metal cladding to reflect the neighbouring industrial sheds was appropriate for a residential building.
40. Amenity:
- Concerns raised about outlook from some of the bedrooms and communal living spaces. The enclosure of the north facing courtyard was also questioned as it would already receive little sunlight or daylight, and it was one of the few parts of the building with a clear view of the river.
 - South facing garden space appeared squeezed into the space available and the purpose of land to the south of the building was unclear.
 - The garden space to the west would not have good outlook and would be noisy given its proximity to Chickenhall Lane and HGV parking.
41. 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.
42. **Ecologist** – No objection.

Further comments, July and August 2025

43. Previous concerns regarding the drainage strategy and CEMP have been resolved. Solar shading diagrams have also been provided which show no discernible impact on the riparian zone between the trees and the river.
44. Errors in BNG metric have also been resolved. The proposals would result in a biodiversity net gain of 31.41% in area habitats (off site), 123.78% in hedgerow habitats (on site) and 16.62% in watercourse habitat (off site). Monitoring of habitats for 30 years would be required. A draft Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan is required as a next step.

Further comments, June 2025

45. Concerns remain about the proximity of the development to the Barton River, however, based on further information provided by the applicant, there would be no ecological grounds for objection.
46. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) - The shadow HRA has screened out potential effects on the River Itchen SAC other than water pollution, siltation, hydrological changes and inappropriate water levels. Water pollution must be assessed at the Appropriate Assessment stage for the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar and Solent Maritime SAC. The nutrient offset mitigation scheme is proposed to mitigate the effects of nutrients from the scheme.
47. The SuDS mitigation is proposed to show no net increase in pollution from surface water runoff. Section 5.10 states that the filtration systems proposed would provide >0.95 pollution indices This should be corrected to pollution mitigation indices (as opposed to pollution hazard indices). The measures proposed in sections 5.12 to 5.17 seem appropriate to mitigate dust and sediment during construction and must be incorporated into the drainage strategy and CEMP.
48. The planting proposed in the buffer zone to the River Barton is mostly appropriate, however pendulous sedge spreads very easily and can become invasive. A different sedge species should be used. The use of plastic guards is not recommended as these could enter the river. If guards are required they should be cardboard, wood or metal and carefully monitored and removed when damaged or no longer needed. The landscape management plan and habitat management plan must include assessment for invasive species and removal of tree guards.
49. The potential effects of shading from the building onto the SAC buffer zone have not been addressed.
50. Construction Environmental Management Plan: Recommendations were previously made for updates to the CEMP, which do not appear to

have been made. The dust suppression recommendations for the CEMP listed in section 5.15 and 5.16 are appropriate. The site logistics plan shows the material storage to be located as far from the river as possible. Any construction refuse must be sufficiently enclosed to prevent any waste from escaping or being blown about and into the river.

51. Landscaping – The main changes to the landscape plan appears to be addition of more trees along the eastern boundary, removal of a tree in the garden and removal of a rain garden area. These changes are acceptable from an ecological perspective.

Further comments, March 2024

52. An updated drainage plan has been provided which shows 3 forms of treatment to the surface water drainage from the car park. The surface water drainage pathways are proposed as Hydro Filter Channel Drain for the car park and a filter strip for the roof drainage, then permeable paving sub-base and a SPEL Smartceptor. This satisfies the requirements of DM6 and demonstrates that the pollution indices as shown in the Ciria SuDS manual have been fully mitigated. The outflow swale is still shown in the updated drainage layout but is no longer being considered as a stage of filtration.
53. Still potential concerns relating to flood risk, subject to Environment Agency comments.
54. Concern that a secure ecology area adjacent to the river may not be possible due to fishing rights.

Original comments, February 2025:

55. Objection on the grounds of layout, proximity and lack of a suitable buffer to the River Itchen SAC. The SuDS strategy also does not meet the requirements of Policy DM6. The application would fail a Habitats Regulations Assessment due to impacts on the SAC.
56. The site lies within priority habitat along the Barton River, which is designated as protected waters of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. It is functionally linked to the rest of the ecologically sensitive River Itchen complex and within 10m of the SAC boundary. The 8 to 15m buffer proposed in this application is not sufficient to protect the SAC. The buffer must not contain any development including buildings, footpaths, gardens, fencing, light spill or car parking. The proposed building would be 3 storeys tall and would cause an unacceptable amount of shading to the SAC buffer, especially in winter. The biodiversity net gain calculations would need to be revisited with a revised layout.
57. Drainage - The surface water drainage strategy lists four rain gardens, French drains, permeable paving and a swale as forms of treatment for

runoff, however it has not been demonstrated that all of the surface water will be treated by all of these components. The proposed swale is located outside of the red line boundary and is too short. It would not function as a form of water treatment when overtopped by high water. The surface water drainage from the car park would only have one form of treatment provided by the permeable paving.

58. Tables 3 and 4 on the simple index approach have been copied from the SuDS manual and inferences made, but the specific calculations for the roof water and car park areas in this application have not been done. It is also not clear whether these components are compatible with the high ground water levels on site. The site investigation reported ground water encountered at depths from 0.58m to 1.22m below ground level, so ground water flooding must also be considered. Permeable paving is proposed for the majority of the attenuation and is proposed to be 0.5m deep with 30% void storage. This is only slightly shallower than the highest groundwater.
59. Information has not been provided on the flow of surface water through the system and the effects of high groundwater on the proposals. A diagram showing the path of each surface water flow with arrows would be required to demonstrate that all of the surface water passes through at least 3 forms of naturalised filtration within the treatment train before being discharged off site.
60. Other comments - Three hedgerows are identified on site, two of which qualify as habitats of principle importance hedgerows in poor condition. Reptiles were assessed as likely to be present in hedgerow H1. Other neutral grassland in poor condition has been recorded in the southern part of the site, with wetter areas in the southeastern corner identified as Coastal floodplain grazing marsh priority habitat.
61. Protected surveys identify that the site is being used by foraging and commuting bats, nesting birds, common lizards and grass snakes and hedgehogs. Great crested newts have been ruled out due to major barriers to dispersal from known populations. No signs of badgers, water voles or otters recorded, but the habitat is suitable and there are known populations within 1km so a precautionary working method for these species would need to be implemented. This should include pre-works update survey for signs of water voles and otters and habitat management. Any vegetation to be removed must be carried out outside of bird nesting season, unless first checked by a suitably qualified ecologist.
62. The Ecological Impact Appraisal recommends an Ecological Construction and Environmental Management Plan – this could be conditioned. It must contain a biodiversity enhancement plan.
63. Lighting - The bat guidance references included in the Artificial Lighting Strategy are outdated. Latest guidance should be followed. Figures 4

and 5 show the faces of the building and land surrounding the building but there is no key to interpret the colours in the diagrams. The location of bat boxes mounted on the building have not been considered in the lighting assessment. Any hedgerows and trees must also be considered. Full size diagrams with lux level information, direction arrows and the location of bat boxes, hedgerows and trees must be provided. There is also a garden that is not on the lighting diagram, and light spill from windows must be considered in addition to exterior lighting.

64. Landscaping – Clarification needed on various elements of the LEMP including wildflower maintenance, biodiversity enhancements, hedgerow management and use of herbicides and pesticides.
65. CEMP - Locations of the silt barriers and bunds around the eastern perimeter of the site must be added to the site logistics plan. A named site manager must be identified to inspect, repair and replace silt barriers and bunds daily. All excavations and open pipes must be covered at night or fitted with small animal escape ramps. Precautionary working methods for each protected species must be conditioned in a separate document (ECEMP).
66. **Tree Officer** – No objection subject to condition.
67. The submitted arboricultural information suitably demonstrates that remaining trees will be retained and adequately protected. No objection subject to a condition for adherence to the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement.
68. **Highway Authority** – No objection subject to conditions.
69. No objection in principle but note potential future land take for highway improvement works, which could impact on the site layout plans. The Local Highway Authority has plans to improve the Bishopstoke Road / Chickenhall Lane mini roundabout junction. A submitted overlay plan confirms that there is a small area in the north-west corner of the application site that is likely to be required for these works, and there is a possible extra requirement for a maintenance vehicle space on the western boundary. The land to be impacted would comprise landscaped areas rather than areas of built structure or parking. The developer should continue to liaise with HCC regarding these works.
70. Access – Vehicle access is proposed via widening of the existing access junction, to enable two-way vehicle movement and formalise it as a bell-mouth. Tracking drawings are provided to demonstrate how two cars can pass each other and how refuse and fire tenders can access and egress. Visibility splays are also provided showing acceptable visibility, subject to cutting back of some adjacent bushes. Visibility creation and retention would need securing by condition.

71. It would usually be preferable to have a drop kerb vehicle crossover to enable pedestrian priority but it is noted that the footway stops to the south of the junction therefore this is not required. The footway to the north is extended into the site for improved pedestrian access and this is welcomed. This will enable staff and visitors to access facilities in Eastleigh by foot, and to access bus stops and cycle routes. Permission will be required from HCC to undertake the access improvement works.
72. Internal site layout – Internal site layout is acceptable with a well laid out car park with adequately sized parking bays and aisle widths, to allow vehicles to turn and leave in a forward gear. Recommend that spaces adjacent to landscaped areas have an additional 0.3m step out strip to prevent trampling. The internal turning head is of sufficient size for refuse vehicle turning, fire tenders and delivery vehicles.
73. Internal footpaths circulate the building and link into the parking area. Whilst a walk across the parking area is needed to reach vehicles and the external footway, this is acceptable given the low level of vehicle movements utilising the site.
74. Parking – Parking numbers are for EBC to assess. Off site parking in this location would be largely controlled by existing Traffic Regulation Orders (yellow lines).
75. Trip generation – The submitted Transport Statement indicates that there would be 9 vehicle movements in the AM peak period and 10 movements in the PM peak period, with a total of 138 movements over a daily 12 hour period. Given the existing movements in the area, it is not anticipated that the site specific trips would have a significant impact. However, in combination with other development in the area, there are wider impacts that need mitigating, such as bus services and infrastructure improvements. A contribution of £59,832 is requested towards:
- Local bus stop improvements;
 - Local bus service funding / subsidies;
 - Pedestrian and cycle improvements in the local area;
 - Highway junction improvements.
76. A Travel Plan has been submitted with the application, which gives a commitment to reduce vehicle trips to assist in sustainable transport aims. HCC would not wish to administer this.
77. Recommend conditions for a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP); Access provision; and parking provision.
78. Material Waste Recycling Facility - The Transport Statement does not reference traffic impacts from the MWC. However, it was agreed that given the low level of additional vehicle movements that the care home would bring, such an assessment and associated junction modelling

would not be required. Whilst the MWC will have an impact to some extent on the 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.

- 79. **Environmental Health – Contaminated land** – No objection subject to conditions.
- 80. A Desk Top Study and Intrusive Ground Investigation has been carried out at the site. These indicate potential for contamination to exist on the site and conditions would be required for a remediation scheme to be agreed and verified. An updated Construction Environmental Management Plan would also be required to include measures to manage risks from asbestos during the demolition of existing structures.
- 81. **Environmental Health – Air Quality** – No objection.

Further comments, June 2025:

- 82. An updated Air Quality Assessment has been submitted, which includes further information on nitrogen dioxide dispersion modelling, and emissions from industrial facilities. The report concludes that concentrations for nitrogen dioxide and particulates as a result of traffic generated by the development would be negligible. It is also concluded that existing industrial facilities have sufficient controls in place to control emissions and would not adversely impact on the proposed development. Glazing and ventilation proposals need to be considered and agreed in line with noise impact advice.
- 83. An updated Construction Environmental Management Plan has also been submitted and the content is agreed.

Original comments, January 2025:

- 84. The submitted Air Quality Assessment focuses on dust impacts. No maps of the area appear to be included in the report, which would help identify receptors and the nearby industrial estate. There are a few operators within the area that hold an environment permit issued by Eastleigh Borough Council to regulate air emissions.
- 85. The decision not to conduct nitrogen dioxide dispersion modelling, based on non-exceedance at the nearest monitoring locations, is not valid. The site is located adjacent to Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) 1 (Eastleigh), making it necessary to conduct modelling using appropriate tools. This is essential to assess potential air quality impacts and identify the significance of the impact of the development to this area.
- 86. Additionally, the reasoning in Sections 5.3 and 3.3 of the report, which screens out the assessment based on a single traffic movement

difference, is not a cautious approach. A more conservative evaluation is required.

87. The conclusion in the section on 'Mitigation Measures' states that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) 'may be' required. This is not acceptable. Given the sites location near sensitive ecological receptors and the magnitude of the development, a site specific CEMP would be required.
88. The assessment accounting for dust sources from the adjacent industrial estate to users of the proposed development, where several operators hold environmental permits with EBC, seems to be missing. The installation of a high quality and appropriate ventilation system should be recommended to mitigate exposure of future users to pollutants.
89. Given the proximity of the development to the town centre, Best Practice Design Measures should also be incorporated (possibly through planning condition), including (but not limited to):
 - Provision of a Travel Plan to encourage sustainable travel options
 - Secure cycle storage
 - Electric vehicle charging points
 - Access to cycling and walking routes connecting to Bishopstoke Road.
90. Summary – the current assessment appears inconclusive and requires further improvements, notably in:
 - Assessing road traffic impacts due to the proximity to AQMA 1;
 - Considering dust sources from nearby industrial estate;
 - Recommending effective ventilation system for future residents;
 - Addressing dust impacts of the construction phase.
91. **Environmental Health – Noise** – No objection subject to conditions.

Comments on Noise Assessment Addendum, June 2025

92. The Noise Assessment addendum updates the noise calculations in relation to HGV traffic flows anticipated from an approved Material Recycling Centre on Chickenhall Lane. Having reviewed the addendum, the difference in noise from the additional HGV's would be marginal and there are no concerns regarding this specific matter.
93. A HVAC system is required to provide ventilation and cooling, which is key to achieving the noise criteria. This also requires maintenance.
94. The site will require considerable heavy mitigation in terms of acoustic glazing and mechanical ventilation (mechanical cooling) and the outside amenity areas only reach the external amenity noise criteria due to proposed garden walls and garden rooms.

Original comments, January 2025

95. The submitted acoustic survey shows the predominance of transportation (road traffic) noise, which was not increased by Airplane Noise Data being the flightpath to Southampton Airport. Industrial noise from the Barton Park Estate did not increase levels and proposed plant noise (kitchen and bathroom extraction) was of low impact.
96. The report satisfactorily demonstrates that daytime/nighttime internal noise levels can be achieved to BS 8233 levels with varying mitigation including acoustic glazing and ventilation scheme (passive and mechanical). The ventilation scheme would also address overheating. Residential communal gardens are also to be formed by a walled garden to reduce noise levels to an acceptable 55dB. The recommendations of the Noise Report should be secured by condition.
97. **Heritage Officer** – No objection.
98. The nearest heritage assets are the locally listed terrace of houses in Baron Road to the west, separated by two industrial buildings, and the terraced housing in Dutton Lane to the north-west which is also separated by an industrial building. The closest listed buildings are Bishopstoke Manor approximately 125m north of Bishopstoke Road and south of the River Itchen, with Itchen House and its Coach House just north of this and the river. These buildings stand behind dense tree belts and the other side of the sports ground, and therefore the development will not affect the setting of these heritage assets.
99. The proposed building's mass is relieved by various protruding bays and material changes to give some articulation. Projecting brick coursing detail is important to alleviate the feeling of blandness. In conclusion, the development will not detrimentally affect the setting of any heritage assets due to intervening buildings.
100. **Natural England** – Further information required.
101. Following review of the Habitats Regulations Assessment Appropriate Assessment, Natural England requests further information in relation to the Council's phosphate strategy. As it stands, Natural England does not consider that there is sufficient certainty to determine that there would not be an impact on designated sites.

102. **Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)** – No objection.

Further comments, April 2025:

103. The updated Drainage Technical Note TN03 has addressed the points previously raised. Advice is provided for the applicant in relation to

maintenance of the SuDS system and works relating to watercourses (informative).

Original comments, February 2025:

104. It is proposed to manage surface water flows using permeable paving, rain gardens and other features before discharging into the Barton River. Whilst discharge into the watercourse is considered appropriate, the proposal to discharge at 5l/s cannot be accepted as it is in excess of the greenfield runoff rate and has not been given approval by the Environment Agency. Unless other agreements are in place, the drainage strategy must demonstrate a discharge rate of no greater than 2l/s.
105. A hydrobrake has been identified prior to the outfall headwall. Clarification required in relation to the discharge rate and also the operation of the hydrobrake in flood/high flow conditions. It is referenced that a non-return valve would be included but it is not clear where this is or how it would operate in high flow conditions. The outfall swale cannot be considered as part of the treatment features due to its short length.
106. Groundwater levels have not been identified and may affect permeable paving unless tanked or lined.
107. Cover levels across the site have been identified as 11.45m AOD, which does not take account of existing falls across the area or the exceedance routing identified. Further details required in relation to land level changes.
108. **Southern Water** – No objection subject to conditions.
109. There is currently adequate capacity in the local sewerage network to accommodate a foul flow of 0.304 l/s for the development at manhole reference SU46191102. Surface water flows cannot be accommodated within the foul sewerage system unless agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority in consultation with Southern Water.
110. Southern Water can provide a water supply to the site. This will require formal connection and on-site mains to be made by the developer.
111. Full details of foul and surface water disposal must be agreed before development commences. Maintenance of the sustainable drainage system is also required.
112. Advice provided about the locations of swales, soakaways, ponds and watercourses in proximity of a water main. The exact position of public assets must be determined on site.

113. **Utilities Services (SSEN and Southern Gas)** – Advice provided for the developer's attention.
114. **Environment Agency** – No objection subject to conditions.

Further comments, April 2025

115. Following receipt of further information in the Drainage Technical Note TN03, the Environment Agency confirms no objection subject to a condition to ensure that the finished floor levels of the development are set no lower than 11.60 AOD metres above Ordnance Datum. This is to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.
116. The flood modelling used by the applicant (River Itchen Flood Model) is confirmed as acceptable.
117. Advice provided regarding flood warning and responses.

Original comments,

118. The submitted FRA does not comply with the requirements for site specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change planning practice guidance and its site specific flood risk assessment checklist. The FRA does not adequately assess the flood risks posed by the development. In particular, it fails to take the impacts of climate change into account. The FRA has not provided climate change levels for the site using the latest available climate change allowances.
119. Although the site extents have been set wholly within the current day Flood Zone 1, the EA does not consider that an adequate assessment of future risk has been undertaken. Modelled data for the River Itchen is based upon old climate change allowances. The model is in the process of being updated but these will not be available until summer 2025.
120. The FRA has stated that finished floor levels will be set no lower than 11.60m AOD, which is 300mm above the highest 0.1% flood level. Although an extreme flood event, the 0.1% flood does not equate to the 1% 35% climate change allowance that should be used to assess future flood risk.
121. Given the size of the development, ground floor sleeping accommodation and the potentially vulnerability of the users, the EA considers it critically important that a detailed assessment of future climate change flood risk is undertaken for the site, and finished floor levels set accordingly.

122. The availability of safe access and egress should also be considered against the 1%, 35% climate change level. The FRA should also demonstrate that there will be no loss of floodplain storage volume, over the lifetime of the development.
123. Advice provided to the applicant regarding environmental permitting.
124. **Southampton Airport Airside Operations** – No detailed comments received.
125. **NHS Care Commission** – No comments received.

Policy Context and Designations Applicable to Site

- Countryside
- Settlement Gap
- Adjacent to (within 400m of) Barton River, part of the River Itchen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Ashtrim Nurseries Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) to south-east of the site
- Swamp West of Recreation Grounds SINC to north
- Adjacent to River Side employment area
- Surface water flood risk on site
- Adjacent to flood zones 2 and 3
- Minerals beneath the site (sand/gravel)
- Barton Road locally listed buildings to west
- Public footpath to east of site
- New Forest recreation impact zone
- Itchen and Solent SPA catchment – nitrates and phosphates
- Gas pipe along Chickenhall Lane and Bishopstoke Road
- Sewer crossing west side of site
- Adjacent to Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)

Development Plan

126. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require a Local Planning Authority determining an application to do so in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan comprises the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. The NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance constitute material considerations of significant weight.
127. The development plan for Eastleigh comprises the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).

Development Plan Policies

128. The most relevant policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan are:

- S1 (Delivering sustainable development)
- S2 (Approach to new development)
- S3 (Location of new housing)
- S5 (New development in the countryside)
- S6 (Protection of settlement gaps)
- S8 (Historic environment)
- S9 (Green infrastructure)
- S11 (Transport infrastructure)
- DM1 (General criteria for new development)
- DM2 (Environmentally sustainable development)
- DM3 (Adaptation to climate change)
- DM5 (Managing flood risk)
- DM6 (Sustainable surface water management)
- DM8 (Pollution)
- DM11 (Nature conservation)
- DM12 (Heritage Assets)
- DM13 (General development criteria – transport)
- DM14 (Parking)
- DM25 (Delivering older peoples housing)
- DM38 (Funding infrastructure)

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan

129. Policy 15 – Safeguarding of Mineral Resources.

Supplementary Planning Documents

130. Relevant Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) include:

- Quality Places (November 2011);
- Accommodation for Older People and Those in Need of Care (May 2011);
- Parking Standards (September 2025);
- Biodiversity (December 2009);
- Planning Obligations (July 2008, updated 2010);
- Hampshire Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire SPD (February 2016)

National Planning Policy Framework

131. At national level, the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF' or the 'Framework') is a material consideration of significant weight in the determination of planning applications. The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF' or the 'Framework') states that (as required by statute) applications for planning permission must be determined in

accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and sets out a general presumption in favour of sustainable development unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A deliverable 5 year supply of housing within each local authority area is required, and if this is not demonstrated a tilted balance in favour of the development applies. Agent of Change principles protect existing businesses.

132. Three dimensions of sustainability are to be sought jointly: economic (supporting economy and ensuring land availability); social (providing housing, creating high quality environment with accessible local services); and environmental (contributing to, protecting and enhancing natural, built and historic environment) whilst local circumstances should also be taken into account, so that development responds to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.

National Planning Practice Guidance

133. Where material, the Planning Practice Guidance which supports the provisions and policies of the NPPF should be afforded weight in the consideration and determination of planning applications.

ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPOSAL:

Principle of the proposal

Sustainable development

134. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places emphasis on sustainable development and requires proposals to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (paragraph 2).
135. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF provides further guidance on the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This includes the requirement that developments that accord with an up-to-date development plan are approved without delay (paragraph 11(c)). Paragraph 11(d), states that where there are no relevant development plan policies or the policies most important for determining the application are out of date, permission should be granted unless:
- i. *The application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or*
 - ii. *Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed*

places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

136. Footnote 7 of the NPPF confirms that the policies referred to in point (i) above include those relating to habitats and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This is relevant to the application sites which lies adjacent to the River Barton, which forms part of the River Itchen SSSI and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
137. Footnote 8 clarifies that policies are considered out of date for applications involving the provision of housing where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, which is currently the case for Eastleigh Borough Council. The most recent housing land supply calculations have determined that Eastleigh can achieve around 4.1 years supply of housing, which falls below the five year supply requirement. Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF therefore applies to the consideration of this application.
138. However, paragraph 12 of the NPPF emphasises that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making.
139. The NPPF defines sustainable development in relation to three objectives - economic, social and environmental - which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways. The way in which the proposed development would contribute towards these objectives is considered below:
140. **Economic** – the NPPF paragraph 8(a) describes the economic objective as: *‘To help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, but ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time for growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure’.*
141. The proposed development would contribute to the local economy by providing employment opportunities both short term during construction and long term through staffing and servicing requirements for the care home. The applicant has stated that the care home would provide 40 full time equivalent and 20 part time equivalent jobs. There would also be benefits to the local economy from increased local spend.
142. **Social** – The social objective is to: *‘support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being’.*

143. The proposed development would contribute to the provision of care accommodation for older persons, for which there is a recognised need in the Borough. It is also located in a sustainable location close to Eastleigh Town centre with good accessibility to local services and public transport.
144. The applicant has noted that care homes can help to ease pressure on local healthcare services as nurses in care homes can deal with some minor issues, freeing up GP time. GP visits can also be carried out more efficiently within a care home. In addition, the applicant has referred to wider community benefits from social events that may take place at the care home, such as local group meetings and seasonable events. The provision of additional care home places also potentially frees up existing housing stock.
145. **Environmental** - This relates to the protection and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity and minimising pollution. These matters are all discussed in further depth under the relevant sections of this report, but in summary the scheme has been designed to enhance biodiversity, protect future residents from pollution impacts and to achieve energy efficiency.

Local Plan Policy Conflict

146. Policies S2 and S3 of the Local Plan relate to the supply and location of new housing in the Borough, with Policy S3 emphasising the aim to focus as much new housing as possible within existing urban areas. The site lies within the countryside and settlement gap between Eastleigh and Bishopstoke, and Policies S5 and S6 set out specific requirements for development in these areas. Whilst paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF states that policies are considered out of date where a five year housing land supply cannot be achieved, this does not mean that no weight can be applied to them. The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan was adopted less than 5 years ago, in 2022, and a review of the Local Plan is currently underway with the main aim to address housing need. It is therefore considered that the Local Plan policies can continue to be afforded weight in decision making.
147. Policy S5 does not support new build residential development outside the urban edge, other than in specific circumstances such as for the provision of rural workers dwellings or gypsy and traveller accommodation. The proposed construction of a new care home in this location is therefore in direct conflict with Policy S5 of the Local Plan.
148. Policy S6 relates to development in settlement gaps and states that development will only be permitted if it would not undermine the physical extent and/or visual separation of settlements, and would not have an urbanising effect detrimental to the character of the countryside or separate identity of adjoining settlements.

149. The site lies within the settlement gap that separates Eastleigh from Bishopstoke. In the Settlement Gap Study (2020) that was prepared in support of the Adopted Local Plan, the gap is split into a number of sections, with the application site falling within area F9, 'Itchen Valley'. This area is described as follows on page 95: *'Large expansive floodplain which changes from dense vegetation at the confluence of the river corridor where it runs beneath Bishopstoke Road to the north, opening to create a mosaic of riparian vegetation, pasture and associated field boundary hedgerows and ditches. This provides a strong sense of openness / visual screen between the industrial land use along the Eastleigh edge and the low-level housing to the southern edge of Bishopstoke'*.
150. The site lies adjacent to Bishopstoke Road in the north-westernmost section of Area 9, which is one of the narrowest points of the settlement gap. In the section on 'Access through the Gap' on page 91 of the Settlement Gap Study, it is noted that one of the main ways in which the gap is experienced is by motorists travelling along Bishopstoke Road between the two settlements.
151. On page 96 of the Study, it is further emphasised that the Itchen Valley contributes to the open nature of the gap and is necessary to provide separation between the residential edge of Bishopstoke and the industrial development on the edge of Eastleigh. The table on page 96 confirms that the area performs a role against all five functions of a settlement gap (helps preserve the open nature of the gap; helps maintain the sense of separation between settlements; plays an important role in defining the settlement character; plays an important role in the separation of settlements at risk of coalescence; and is necessary in prevent the coalescence of settlements).
152. More recently, as part of the Local Plan Review, an Interim Settlement Gaps Background Paper was published in December 2024. The purpose of this paper was to assess potential development site options within settlements gaps that have been submitted through the call for sites. The application site was submitted through this process and has been assessed in the Background Paper (Eastleigh-Bishopstoke Gap Site 5). In this assessment it is noted that at Site 5, the gap is narrow and separates a town from a village. The assessment concludes that development of the site would represent a significant reduction in the width of the gap at its narrowest point and would be visible from Bishopstoke Road. The impact of development on the gap is concluded to be 'major'.
153. The site currently comprises an open field, with only some small buildings located near the access. The proposed development comprising a large 3-storey building with its associated formal access, parking and ancillary requirements would inevitably change the character of this site from that of a rural field to an urban development.

The impact of this on the character of the area and settlement gap is assessed in further detail in the relevant section of this report, but in summary it is considered that development of the site as proposed would result in a harmful impact upon the settlement gap, in conflict with Policy S6.

Need for care accommodation and accessibility

154. The proposal would provide a new care home which would help towards meeting the need for care accommodation within the Borough and contribute to the Borough's housing land supply. The requirement to cater for housing needs of different groups is set out in the NPPF, with paragraph 63 stating that within the context of establishing housing need, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policy. This includes the need for older people including those who require retirement housing, housing with care and care homes.
155. For Eastleigh, reports carried out in 2017 during the preparation of the Local Plan, including a 'Demography Background Paper' and an 'Assessment of Affordable Housing and Other Housing Types', predicted a substantial increase in the population of the Borough in older age groups during the period 2016-2036. The reports identified that more specialist, adaptable accommodation would be required within the Borough to meet the needs of the increased older person population, and that the delivery of Class C2 bedspaces was one element of the overall requirements. The applicants have also submitted their own care needs assessment, which predicts an increase in older persons in the Borough up to 2027 with a specific demand for dementia care beds exceeding the supply.
156. To help meet identified needs, Policy DM25 of the Local Plan provides specific support for increasing the supply of specialist accommodation for older persons. The policy requires that such development is located in sustainable locations with good access to the public transport network, close to local facilities and well-integrated into the local community. The Council's SPD on accommodation for older people expands on this and advises that sites should be located within 400m of services and facilities so that residents are well connected with the local community and do not need to leave the local area to access key services. The application site is well located in terms of accessibility, being around 500m from Eastleigh town centre and railway station, and with a petrol station shop directly opposite. The site is therefore considered to meet the accessibility objectives for older persons accommodation, although as residents of the care home are likely to be subject to high levels of care, the accessibility of the site would be of more benefit to staff and visitors than the residents themselves.

157. In summary, the provision of new care accommodation, along with the contribution towards the Council's housing land supply, are acknowledged as benefits of the scheme to be taken into account in the planning balance.

Design considerations and impact on the settlement gap

Layout

158. The site layout has been informed by the shape of the site and environmental constraints. It is tapered in shape, with a narrower section on the northern side, widening out to the south. The south and east boundaries of the site are irregular in form and reflect the boundary of identified flood zones on adjacent land next to the Barton River. The Barton River itself is a designated SSSI and SAC and requires a suitable buffer to protect its nature conservation interests. The proposed care home would be located on the wider part of the site and would have an L-shaped form, set back from Bishopstoke Road by around 50m and from Chickenhall Lane by 28m. Acknowledging that both Chickenhall Lane and Bishopstoke Road are busy main roads with associated noise and pollution, the proposal to site the building away from these road frontages is considered appropriate in principle. It is also accepted that the adjacent environmental constraints mean that an alternative layout for a building of the proposed scale would be difficult to achieve.
159. Notwithstanding the acceptability of the layout addressing the constraints of the site there are concerns as to the resulting visual impacts of a development of this size in this location within the countryside and settlement gap, as expanded in the relevant section of this report.

Architectural design, scale and mass

160. In terms of elevational appearance, the proposed use of brick detailing, projecting building sections and cladding to highlight the entrance area and provide variation in materials, is considered acceptable. Whilst the architectural design of the building is rather generic and does little in trying to respond to the surrounding context of the site, there is nothing unacceptable about it in planning terms. However, there are reservations regarding its overall scale and mass and the impact upon the character of the area and settlement gap.
161. Through the course of the application process, some changes have been made to the roof form of the building to seek to respond to comments from the Council's Urban Design Officer and Design Review Panel. The Design Review Panel noted that the physical scale of the building was a concern, which was not helped by the unrelieved flat roof form, and they suggested a variation in roof

height or a splitting of the two wings of the building. Similarly, the Urban Design Officer commented on the flat roof and continuous parapet which made the building visually bulky with an institutional feeling and suggested that consideration be given to breaking up the mass of the building by creating separate built forms with recessed linking elements.

162. Following amendments, the previously proposed flat parapet now incorporates a variation in height with the parapets above the projecting elements of the building being taller than the main parapet. This change provides variation in the visual appearance of the roof form, which is considered an improvement, but does not significantly reduce the bulk of the building as a whole, which remains as an L-shaped solid structure.

Impact on the settlement gap

163. The application site is located in the north-western corner of Area 9 of the settlement gap between Eastleigh and Bishopstoke (as defined in the Settlement Gap Study), on the eastern corner of Chickenhall Lane and Bishopstoke Road. The northern end of Chickenhall Lane currently provides a clear distinction between the industrial estate on the west side of the road and the countryside to the east. There is very little development on the eastern side of Chickenhall Lane until you get to the water treatment works further south. The application site comprises an open field with some small buildings near the access and is bound by hedgerows along the east and northern boundaries, and trees adjacent to the Barton River to the east.
164. The application site lies in one of the narrowest points of the gap, which is visible by people travelling along Bishopstoke Road (both on foot and by vehicle), on one of the main routes into and out of Eastleigh. When travelling from Eastleigh towards Bishopstoke, the edge of the settlement of Eastleigh is clearly defined in this location by the edge of the industrial estate on the south side of Bishopstoke Road and the office building on the north side. The application site with its strong hedgerow boundary and absence of development creates a key visual transition between the built-up settlement and the countryside and river valley which extends to the east. By locating a building of the proposed size on this site with its associated infrastructure, the character and appearance of the site would change entirely, merging visually with the settlement of Eastleigh and reducing the extent of the gap both physically and visually.
165. To justify the proposed development in this location, the applicants have provided a Landscape and Visual Statement and submitted CGI images to seek to demonstrate that the development would not have a significant visual impact on the character of the area. They have noted that the visibility of the site from the wider surrounding area to the east is restricted by existing trees and vegetation which screen views from

nearby footpaths and public areas. This is acknowledged, but it is considered that the applicant has underplayed the impact of the development on shorter distance views from Bishopstoke Road. When travelling either east or west along Bishopstoke Road, there are clear views into the application site and although the views from the east in particular are filtered by vegetation, this is less so in winter months. The applicant has provided a photomontage image of how they consider the care home would be viewed from the roundabout junction of Bishopstoke Road and Chickenhall Lane. This indicates that only the upper part of the roof of the building would be visible above boundary hedgerows, however, this does not account for greater visibility during winter months when the vegetation would be sparser and also assumes that the hedgerow would be maintained at its current high height. It is also considered that views would be greater from other vantage points around the roundabout, as the image only uses one reference point. Officer photographs taken in February 2025 show a lower and less dense hedgerow to that shown in the photomontage and it is considered that during winter months the development would be much more visually prominent. The Highway Authority has also stated that lines of sight splays for the vehicle entrance would need to be kept clear of any obstruction exceeding 1m in height, which would include hedgerows. The extent of vegetation adjacent to the site entrance would therefore likely need to be reduced, making the site entrance appear more urban and formal than that shown in the photomontage.

166. There are also concerns relating to possible future highway improvements at the Bishopstoke Road / Chickenhall Lane roundabout which would likely require further removal of the existing hedge planting along the northern edge of the application site. If these improvements are to be implemented, removal of the existing hedge would open up greater views into the site from the roundabout, adding to concerns as to the scheme's impact upon the settlement gap.
167. In order to address the potential loss of the roadside vegetation, due to the highway improvement works, amended landscape plans have been submitted showing additional new landscape and tree planting behind the existing boundary hedgerow, which would be implemented as part of the wider site landscaping proposals. This would mean that should the highway improvement scheme go ahead, and the existing hedgerow removed, there would be planting in place which would assist in tempering the resulting visual impact on views from the roundabout.
168. In summary, the proposal is considered to go against all of the criteria in Policy S6, as it would reduce an already narrow part of the gap, physically undermining the separation of settlements, and would result in an urbanising effect which would negatively impact the character of the countryside and the separate identity of the settlements in this location. The additional planting proposed would assist in reducing the overall impact but is not considered sufficient

to overcome the visual harm to the countryside and settlement gap setting as set out above.

Impact on heritage assets

169. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states: *'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, the Local Planning Authority ... shall have regard to the desirability of reserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'*.
170. There is a row of locally listed buildings on Barton Road to the west of the site, but these are screened from the proposed development by existing industrial buildings, and their setting would therefore not be impacted by the proposal. The Council's Heritage Advisor has raised no objection to the scheme.

Landscaping and trees

171. The application is accompanied by landscape plans showing proposals for the retention of existing vegetation and provision of new planting and landscaping around the site. Key elements would include the retention of hedgerows along much of the eastern and northern boundaries, including new landscape planting at the northern end of the site behind the existing hedge, retention of trees on the west side of the site and creation of amenity areas for residents with grassed lawns and ornamental planting. Rain gardens are also proposed to provide amenity and biodiversity value, and paved areas and pathways would be created to provide access around the site. The plans have been reviewed by the Council's Landscape Officer who has raised some queries about species types and on-going maintenance of hedgerows. Concern was also raised about the proposed fencing around the substation, as it is considered that higher quality materials could be used. However, these matters of detail can be resolved through the recommended landscape condition.
172. In terms of tree impacts, the Council's Tree Officer commented that the principle arboricultural feature of the site is the tree line that lies to the west of the Barton River. It was noted that some trees appeared to have been removed prior to submission of the planning application and the applicant confirmed that this was the case due to falling branches, but the majority of the tree line remains in place. It has also been confirmed that the removed trees have been accounted for in the calculations of biodiversity net gain. An Arboricultural Method Statement has been provided with the

application which sets out how the retained trees and hedgerows would be protected during construction and the measures proposed are considered acceptable. Adherence to the tree protection plan is secured by condition.

Ecology matters and biodiversity net gain

173. The site lies adjacent to the Barton River, which is a tributary of the River Itchen and is designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the impact on this protected watercourse is therefore a key consideration in the determination of the application.
174. In the initial comments from the Council's Ecologist, significant concerns were raised about the proximity of the proposed building to the adjacent river and potential impacts of pollution from surface water run-off as well as impacts on the adjacent river environment from shading from the proposed building. The applicant has since submitted a Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment Appropriate Assessment which considers the potential impacts in detail.
175. In relation to surface water run-off, the application is accompanied by a drainage strategy, which has been designed to meet the requirements of Policy DM6 of the Local Plan by incorporating three forms of filtration to ensure that pollutants are removed before entering the watercourse. The drainage strategy has also been designed to ensure that the level of run-off from the site would not materially change the water flow in the river from that which it experiences under existing greenfield conditions. The proposed drainage strategy has been agreed as acceptable by the Council's Ecologist and the Lead Local Flood Authority.
176. A number of measures are also proposed to protect the watercourse during the construction phase of the development, which includes measures to minimise dust and particulates, provision of a dedicated plant refuelling area and appropriate storage locations and monitoring procedures for plant and equipment. These measures could be secured through a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
177. In relation to the buffer zone and shading impacts, the applicant's assessment has confirmed that there would be no discernible impact from shading on the riparian zone, and that other impacts on the adjacent river could be satisfactorily mitigated. Whilst the Council's Ecologist remains concerned about the proximity of the building to the watercourse, they have concurred with the conclusions of the Shadow HRA and have raised no objection.
178. In terms of impacts on habitats and protected species, an Ecological Impact Appraisal was submitted with the application, which confirms

that the existing site comprises predominantly modified and natural grassland with native hedgerows and trees around the boundary. The hedgerows and trees were identified as providing suitable habitat for nesting birds and bats, with bats recorded during activity surveys. A low population of common lizards and grass snakes were also identified, and the site is noted as suitable for hedgehogs. The land adjacent to the river was also noted as providing suitable habitat for otter and water voles. In order to ensure that the identified species are protected, the following design and mitigation measures have been proposed:

- Retention of hedgerows and trees to protect habitats for birds and bats;
- Areas of retained grass to be enhanced with additional habitat for reptiles;
- Sensitive lighting scheme to protect bat corridors from inappropriate light pollution;
- Implementation of precautionary working methods and procedures to ensure that habitats and species are not harmed during construction;
- Enhancement of the riverside environment by reducing intensive management and introducing new willow and alder scrub planting.
- Implementation of a Landscape Environmental Management Plan to ensure long term management of all retained and enhanced habitats.

179. The Council's Ecologist has confirmed that the proposed mitigation measures as set out in the Ecological Impact Assessment are appropriate and can be secured by condition.

Biodiversity net gain

180. Under the provisions of the Environment Act 2021, there is a requirement for the development to achieve 10% biodiversity net gain. This is being achieved through the provision of new habitats and planting within the application site and on adjacent land within the applicant's ownership, next to the Barton River. Within the application site red line boundary, the landscaping proposals would include new shrub planting, modified grassland and rain gardens. On the land adjacent to the river, the proposals include the removal of modified grassland and introduced scrub, and creation of willow scrub and mixed scrub, which provides enhanced biodiversity value. Additional trees are also proposed to be planted to compensate for two trees that were removed prior to submission of the planning application. In combination, the proposals are calculated to achieve the required net gain in biodiversity.

Flood risk and drainage

181. When the application was submitted, the Environment Agency's flood maps showed the site itself (as per the red line on the location plan) to be in Flood Zone 1 (low risk), but land directly adjacent to it, next to the Barton River, to be within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (higher risk). There is also some surface water flood risk on the west side of the site.
182. On 25th March 2025, the Environment Agency updated its flood mapping and the updated maps indicated that almost the whole site was within Flood Zone 2. However, in the Environment Agency's comments on the application (dated 7 April 2025), they state that whilst the new flood risk datasets show a larger extent of flood zones 2 and 3 at this site, the applicant has used the EA's River Itchen Flood Model, which is considered to be a more detailed representation of flood risk than the latest Flood Map and confirms that the site is in Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency is therefore satisfied that flood risk considerations have been adequately assessed by the applicant and has raised no objection provided that finished floor levels are set at an appropriate level as identified in the Flood Risk Assessment.
183. The Flood Risk Assessment also sets out details of the drainage strategy for the site. For foul water, the proposal would be to connect foul water discharge to the existing Southern Water sewer. For surface water, a sustainable drainage system is proposed, utilising rain gardens, French drains and permeable paving to provide storage and treatment of surface water run-off. The drainage strategy would also incorporate filtration measures to prevent pollution of the adjacent watercourse, and the strategy has been reviewed and agreed by the Council's Ecologist and the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Access, parking and transport Matters

Access

184. Access to the site would be via a new bell mouth junction created by extending the existing access point on Chickenhall Lane. This would allow two-way vehicle movement, and the Highway Authority has confirmed it is acceptable in terms of its design and level of visibility. Tracking drawings have also been provided to confirm that the access and internal layout is acceptable for refuse and emergency vehicles. The visibility splays would need to be kept clear of tall vegetation, which is something that can be controlled by condition.
185. The plans also include the provision of a new section of footway leading north from the access to connect with the existing footway along Bishopstoke Road. This would ensure direct pedestrian access to and from the site and to the nearby facilities and services in Eastleigh town centre.

Parking

186. The Eastleigh Borough Council Parking Standards set out that a care home development should provide 1 parking space per 6 bedrooms plus 1 parking space per staff member. In addition, 1 cycle parking space is required per staff member.
187. The applicants have stated that there would be a total of 22 members of staff on site at any one time. This is consistent with staffing level predictions for similar sized care homes in the Borough. The parking requirement for the proposed 70 bed care home would therefore be calculated as follows:
- 1 parking space required per 6 rooms: $70/6 = 11.6$, rounded up to 12
 - 1 space required per staff member (on site at any one time) = 22
 - Total parking required = 34
188. A total of 24 parking spaces are shown on the site plan, which is a reduction in 10 from the Adopted Parking Standards. The applicant has stated that this accords with their operational requirements and that staff and visitors would be encouraged to use sustainable transport. As the site is in walking distance to Eastleigh Train Station and nearby bus services, the potential for the use of sustainable transport for staff is accepted in this location.
189. The Highway Authority has also raised no significant concern about the potential for overspill parking, noting that surrounding roads are subject to existing restrictions by means of double yellow lines. Some concerns have been raised by local businesses about the potential for parking at the industrial estate, but it is considered that this would be controlled by private parking management. In addition, a Travel Plan has been submitted with the application to set out measures that would be put in place to encourage sustainable transport use among staff. This would be managed and a Travel Plan Coordinator and measures would include:
- Provision of information packs to staff giving details of walking and cycling routes, public transport times and car sharing benefits;
 - Promotion of public transport opportunities through staff newsletters;
 - Liaison with local bus operators to seek opportunities for offers such as discounted tickets;
 - Provision of a travel planning service for staff.
190. Taking all of the above points into account, it is considered that the reduced level of parking can be accepted in this location and would not result in a harmful impact on the local highway network or highway safety. This conclusion is based on the specific characteristics of the

site and does not necessarily mean that a reduced parking provision would be accepted for other care home developments in the Borough.

191. The internal parking layout has been reviewed by the Highway Authority and confirmed as acceptable in terms of the size of parking bays and manoeuvring space. 0.3m step out strips are recommended for parking spaces adjacent to landscaping and it is considered that there would be adequate space to make this provision.

Traffic impacts

192. The care home is anticipated to generate 9 vehicle movements in the AM peak period and 10 movements in the PM peak period, with a total of 138 trips over a daily 12 hour period. The Highway Authority has commented that, given the existing level of vehicle movements passing through the local highway junctions, the increased level of trips from this development would not have a significant impact on the local highway network. The Highway Authority considers that the impacts that would occur cumulatively with other local developments, can be satisfactorily mitigated through a contribution towards improving public transport and pedestrian and cycle infrastructure. A contribution of £59,832 is requested towards local bus stop improvements, bus service funding, pedestrian and cycle improvements and highway junction improvements.
193. The Highway Authority has noted that there has been a recent planning permission for a Material Recycling Facility (MRF) at the southern end of Chickenhall Lane. Should this development be implemented, it is anticipated to generate up to 128 additional HGV movements on Chickenhall Lane. Looking at the associated report for the MRF application, it was confirmed that the level of HGV movements would be no greater than would have been generated by a previous permission for an Energy Recovery Centre on the same site (granted in 2014), and that financial contributions had already been secured towards highway improvements under that previous permission. The MRF was therefore concluded not to result in a significant impact on the highway network. For this application, the Transport Assessment does not include a specific assessment of the impact of the MRF. However, the Highway Authority has commented that whilst the MRF would impact to some extent on traffic flows through the adjacent highway junctions, due to the low level of additional vehicles proposed to be generated by the care home, it was not considered necessary or reasonable to request any further traffic flow assessment or junction modelling in relation to this application.

Future highway junction improvements

194. The Highway Authority has confirmed that there are plans in progress for the alteration and improvement of the Chickenhall Lane roundabout junction to the north-west of the application site. The plans are currently

in draft form but are likely to include a widening of the carriageway adjacent to the north-western corner of the application site. In order to assist with implementation of the highway improvements, the applicant has offered to transfer the required land to the Highway Authority at no cost, with the transfer being secured as part of a S106 agreement.

195. Whilst the transfer of land is welcomed, an overlay plan has been provided which shows that an area of landscaping on the north-western corner of the site would be affected by the carriageway widening. There is also a possibility that a layby may need to be created on Chickenhall Lane, which again would impact on existing landscaping on the eastern boundary of the application site. As mentioned above, potential removal of the existing hedgerow planting along the northern and western corner of the site would open up clear views of the site from the roundabout, which it is considered would further erode the character of the countryside and settlement gap, weighing against the benefits of gifting the land to the Highway Authority.
196. To address these concerns, amended landscape plans have been submitted showing additional new landscape and tree planting behind the existing boundary hedgerow, which would be implemented as part of the wider site landscaping proposals. This would mean that should the highway improvement scheme go ahead, and the existing hedgerow removed, there would be planting in place which would assist in tempering the resulting visual impact on views from the roundabout.
197. There is also a safeguarded route for a Chickenhall Link Road set out in the Local Plan, which, if progressed, would incorporate the section of Chickenhall Lane adjacent to the application site. However, it is not envisaged that any future works associated with the link road (e.g. road widening) would be so significant as to impact on this application site. There is also no guarantee at this point in time that the link road would come forward.

Residential amenity and noise pollution

198. Policy DM1 of the Local Plan states that new development must not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenities of both new and existing residents.

Amenity of neighbouring residents

199. There are no residential properties close enough to the site to be directly impacted by the proposed development in terms of loss of outlook, light or privacy. Although the development would result in an increase in vehicle movements in the area, given the existing busy nature of Bishopstoke and Chickenhall Lane it is not considered that this impact would be discernible in terms of increased noise and disturbance to nearby residents.

Amenity of future residents

200. In considering the amenity of future residents, the main issues in this case relate to noise impacts, and whether the care home rooms and amenity areas would have good levels of light and outlook.
201. Regarding light and outlook, the majority of the care home bedrooms would face west and south, with a lesser number facing north and east. There is no concern about light to the windows facing west and south, with those facing south having the most favourable outlook over garden areas and an adjacent open field. Shadow diagrams have been provided to show how different parts of the site would be impacted by shading at different times of the year, and this shows that the north and eastern sides of the care home including the main external amenity area, would be subject to quite a high level of shading, both from the building itself and from adjacent trees. The windows facing east would therefore have more restricted light than those facing west or south, but the trees and communal amenity space would provide an attractive outlook. There is more concern about the north facing rooms, particularly those at ground floor level, which would not have direct sunlight and where daylight would be restricted by adjacent trees and the courtyard walls. However, these windows would also have an outlook over the communal gardens, and a daylight assessment has demonstrated that adequate levels of daylight would be achieved for these rooms.
202. In relation to noise, the application site is impacted by noise from a variety of sources including the adjacent industrial estate, nearby airport and traffic on Bishopstoke Road. The development itself is not one that would be considered to generate any significant noise impacts to the surrounding area, therefore the key matter to consider is whether future occupants would be adequately protected from noise within the existing environment.
203. The application is supported by a Noise Impact Assessment, which assesses the various noise impacts on the amenity of future occupiers. In considering traffic noise, the report includes consideration of the traffic to be generated by the recently permitted Material Recycling Facility (MRF) at the southern end of Chickenhall Lane, and the Environmental Health Officer has concurred with the conclusions that any increase in noise resulting from traffic from the MRF facility would be minimal.
204. In terms of internal noise levels for the care home, the report concludes that with appropriate glazing specifications and ventilation (with cooling capabilities) for the care home rooms, an acceptable internal noise level could be achieved. The Council's Environmental Health Officer agrees with this and had the application been considered acceptable, the required glazing and ventilation specifications could be secured by condition. Regarding external

amenity space, it is noted that noise levels in the communal gardens would exceed recommended standards without mitigation. To mitigate the noise impact, it is proposed to provide a walled communal garden on the north-east side of the building, and it is concluded that the walls would reduce noise to an acceptable level.

205. A walled kitchen garden is also proposed on the southern side of the site. However, the remaining more open areas of external amenity space around the south and west of the building would remain subject to noise levels that would exceed the levels set out in the relevant British Standards Noise Guidance (BS 8233:2014 and World Health Organisation). The Noise Report concludes that 50% of the external amenity space would meet the guidance and considers this to be acceptable. Whilst the Council's Environmental Health Officer has not raised an objection to the conclusions of the report and the proposed mitigation, they have highlighted the issue regarding the external amenity space and that it is only the walled areas that would achieve the appropriate noise levels. Residents using the non-walled external amenity areas (i.e. around half of the external amenity space), would therefore be subject to higher than recommended noise levels. Whilst this concern would not in itself be considered sufficient grounds to refuse the scheme, it does indicate that the site may not be the most suitable for a care home and this is a matter that should be taken into account in the planning balance.

Contaminated land

206. The application is supported by a Ground Conditions Assessment, which identified some contamination risk on site. No objection is raised by the Council's Contaminated Land Officer subject to conditions to secure a remediation scheme and verification.

Air Quality

207. The application is supported by an Air Quality Assessment, which was updated during the course of the application to include further information on nitrogen dioxide dispersion modelling, at the request of the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Following review of the updated report, the Environmental Health Officer has concurred with the conclusions that concentrations for nitrogen dioxide and particulates as a result of traffic generated by the development would be negligible and that existing industrial premises have sufficient controls in place to control emissions so as not to adversely impact the proposed development. No objection is therefore raised in relation to air quality impacts.

Minerals

208. The site lies within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Consultation Area (MWCA) due to the presence of underlying sand / gravel. Policy

15 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (HMWP) seeks to protect resources from sterilisation by non-minerals development, and the County Council is required to be consulted for any development over 3ha in size (as per guidance set out in the Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire SPD). As the application site is significantly smaller than 3ha (being 0.6ha), there was no requirement to consult the Minerals and Waste Authority. A Minerals Resource Assessment has also been undertaken by the applicants, which concludes that due to the site size and constraints, neither prior extraction or incidental extraction of minerals would be viable.

Sustainability measures and climate change

209. 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; (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 Environment Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.
210. 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.
211. Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Local Plan require development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. Policy DM2 specifically requires all development over 500 sqm to achieve BREEAM 'excellent' (or equivalent). The application is accompanied by a Sustainability Statement which includes a BREEAM pre-assessment. This confirms that the development aims to achieve sufficient credits to meet the 'excellent' BREEAM rating, in accordance with the policy requirement. a condition requiring conformation of this is recommended.

Impacts on European Protected Sites

Nutrient impacts

212. Natural England has advised that the increase in wastewater from new housing developments and overnight accommodation within the Borough is having a detrimental effect on the quality of water entering the Solent catchment area through eutrophication. As such, all development for additional housing or overnight accommodation is required to reach nutrient neutrality (ensuring the development does not add to existing nutrient burdens), in order to meet the requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The proposed development would be served by the Chickenhall Lane Wastewater Treatment works and is required to achieve nutrient neutrality for nitrates and phosphates.
213. The applicants have submitted a Nutrient Budget calculator which uses an occupancy rate of 0.93 persons per room. This level of occupancy takes account of the care home use and turnover of residents and similar calculations have been accepted as appropriate at other care home developments in the Borough. The calculation confirms that there would be an increase in nitrates and phosphates as a result of the development that would require mitigation.
214. The nutrient impacts can be mitigated using the Council's mitigation strategies, or a suitable alternative scheme, which is secured by condition.

Recreational pressure – New Forest

215. The site lies within the 13.8km catchment area for the New Forest National Park SPA and Natural England has advised that development in this area is likely to result in additional visitors and increased recreational pressure on this protected area.
216. However, as the proposal is for a care home, it is considered unlikely that the development would result in additional visitor pressure on the New Forest. The applicant has stated that the care home would be designed to provide care for residents of all dependency levels, including those requiring specialist dementia care. Residents are unlikely to be capable of leaving their accommodation independently and therefore unlikely to undertake long distance trips to the New Forest. It is therefore not considered that the development would result in increased recreational pressure on the New Forest.

Impact on Barton River SAC and SSSI

217. As discussed in the ecology section of this report, the site lies adjacent to the Barton River, which is a tributary of the River Itchen and is designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and a Site of

Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The development has the potential to impact on the quality of this watercourse through pollution from surface water run-off, during both construction and occupation. To mitigate these impacts, a number of measures are proposed including the provision of a sustainable drainage strategy, restriction of surface water run-off rates and implementation of specific mitigation measures during construction. Construction drainage and post occupancy drainage are secured by conditions.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

218. A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been submitted to Natural England addressing the potential impacts on the European protected sites and explaining how these could be mitigated. Natural England has responded and requested further information in relation to the Council's phosphate mitigation strategy, in order to provide certainty that any impacts would be suitably mitigated. Notwithstanding this response, as the competent determining authority, the Council is satisfied that its mitigation strategy is suitable to address the issue of increased phosphates resulting from the proposed development and a condition is recommended requiring suitable nutrient mitigation to be secured prior to occupation of the development. Other than the concern regarding phosphate mitigation, Natural England has raised no objection to the other proposed mitigation measures.

Planning obligation / considerations

219. In accordance with the NPPF, Policy DM38 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan, the Council's 'Planning Obligations' SPD and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations, there is a requirement for developers' contributions to ensure on and off-site provision for facilities and infrastructure made necessary by the development, or to mitigate against any increased need/pressure on existing facilities. For this scheme, the following contributions are required:
- Public art contribution
 - Sustainable transport contribution.
220. The applicant has submitted a draft S106 agreement which is currently being reviewed by the Council's legal department, which once approved will secure the planning obligations required in addition to providing a biodiversity net gain maintenance and monitoring plan, as well as the transfer of land to the Highway Authority. Payment towards mitigation schemes to achieve nutrient neutrality is also required but would be secured separately to the S106 agreement.

Equalities Implications:

221. 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:
 - i. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - ii. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - iii. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

222. 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, noting that as a care home it would be designed to accommodate the specific needs and accessibility requirements of its residents.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

223. Sections 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

224. As Eastleigh Borough Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply, then provided that impacts on European protected sites can be satisfactorily mitigated, it is necessary to determine the application in accordance with paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the NPPF. This requires an assessment of whether the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole.

225. As set out in this report, the application is for the development of a care home in the countryside and settlement gap, which would be in direct conflict with the development strategy set out in the Local Plan and would result in an urbanising impact upon the character of this area of countryside and upon the settlement gap. There are also some reservations regarding the location of the development in respect of the noisy environment, noting that some of the external amenity space for residents would be subject to noise levels higher than recommended standards, albeit acceptable internal standards can be achieved through the use of appropriate glazing and mechanical ventilation.

226. In terms of benefits, the most notable benefit would be the provision of care accommodation for which there is an identified need within the Borough, along with the potential to free up existing housing stock. There would also be benefits in relation to employment provision and increased local spend, although it is acknowledged

that such benefits could equally be achieved by a similar development in a location that is not contrary to the development plan. In relation to environmental factors, the development includes proposals to enhance landscaping and habitats on and around the site, including adjacent to the Barton River, and would provide a biodiversity net gain. However, the provision of a biodiversity net gain is a national policy requirement for all relevant developments and is considered a neutral benefit. Similarly, the provision of developers contributions towards local infrastructure improvements would be considered a neutral benefit given that such improvements are only required as a direct result of the development (i.e. to offset identified impacts).

227. A further benefit of this particular application is the transfer of land for the proposed Bishopstoke Road / Chickenhall Lane roundabout improvements. This additional land will make the highway improvement scheme easier to undertake, with the improvement scheme then providing wider highway benefits in terms of traffic flow, etc.
228. To conclude, whilst concerns remain as to the visual and physical impact of the proposed development upon the existing character of the countryside and settlement gap, together with reservations as to the appropriateness of the site for a care home and the quality of the design, it is recognised that the development would provide much needed care home places, freeing up existing housing stock for others; local economic benefits; and land for highway improvements, which would benefit the wider area. In terms of the planning balance therefore, it is felt that the benefits brought by the scheme just outweigh the harm which would result to the visual amenity and character of the area and the settlement gap. As such, the application is recommended for approval subject to the completion of a signed S106 agreement which secures the necessary planning obligations, biodiversity net gain and transfer of land to the Highway Authority.

F/24/98678



Address: Land East of Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh.
SO50 6AF

Date: 08/08/2025

Scale: 1:1250