

Delegated Report

Application Number: O/25/99534
Case Officer: Gary Osmond
Received Date: Tuesday 10th June 2025
Site Address: Land at Denhams Corner, Snakemoor Lane, Eastleigh, SO32 2BW
Applicant: Southern Strategic Land Two LLP; John Denham; Shirley George and Heather Baston
Proposal: Outline application for up to 150 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, with vehicle and cycle accesses from Snakemoor Lane, pedestrian/cycle access from Botley Road, sustainable transport hub, public open space and play area, and associated infrastructure and landscaping (all matters reserved except for access).

Recommendation: **REFUSE**

For the following reasons:

- 1) The site is outside of the urban edge and is not allocated for residential development. The proposal represents an inappropriate and unjustified form of development, which would have an unacceptably urbanising and visually intrusive impact upon the designated countryside to the detriment of the character and visual amenity of the local area. These adverse impacts cannot be appropriately mitigated and therefore the application is contrary to Policies S1, S5 & DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).
- 2) The site is considered to be poorly connected by sustainable transport modes to local facilities in Horton Heath, Fair Oak and the surrounding area. The measures included within the proposed development would not result in a genuine choice of transport modes and as such the proposals would result in a car dependant development increasing congestion on the highway network. The application is therefore contrary to Policies S1, S11, DM1 & DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).
- 3) It has not been demonstrated that the proposed site access or the alterations required to local highway infrastructure to serve the development can be undertaken in a manner which will meet the necessary Highway Authority standards and not impact upon traffic flow and movements in the locality. The application is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies S11 & DM13 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).
- 4) The application fails to secure provision for developer contributions for the on and off-site provision of facilities and infrastructure made necessary by the development or to mitigate against any increased need or pressure on existing facilities. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies

S10, DM13, DM28, DM33, DM36 and DM38 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), the Eastleigh Borough Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024).

- 5) The application fails to secure mitigation to offset the impacts of the development on the European protected sites (i.e. River Itchen Special Area of Conservation SAC) from the effects of nutrient loading. The application is therefore contrary to Policies S1, DM10 and DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Report:

Site & Surrounding Context

1. The site comprises an arable field of approximately 9.05ha, located on the north side of Snakemoor Lane and to the east of Botley Road (B3354). The site is bordered by Scorey's Copse to the north, which is a designated Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Ancient Woodland. The trees in Scorey's Copse and to the west are all covered by an area Tree Preservation Order (TPO), part of which is included within the application redline boundary. There is a watercourse to the east of the site, which is a tributary of the River Hamble, and the land adjacent to this is also a SINC (Scorey's Copse Rush Pasture SINC). A public right of way (footpath 719) runs through Scorey's Copse and to the east of the watercourse. Botley Road lies beyond the woodland to the west and there are two residential properties – 'Lane End House' and 'Lane End Stables' – located between the site and on the junction of Snakemoor Lane and Botley Road. To the south is Snakemoor Lane with fields and scattered housing and farms beyond.
2. In terms of topography the top (western) half of the site is relatively level, beginning to gently slope down in an easterly direction at approximately the halfway point, and then steeper approximately three-quarters of the way from the western boundary down to the watercourse with a total drop of ten metres from the highest to lowest point of the site. The majority of the northern and western boundaries are marked by a post and wire fence onto Scorey's Copse; the eastern boundary being marked by a line of trees running parallel to the watercourse; and the southern boundary being marked by a 2.0 metre hedge along Snakemoor Lane. The very eastern side of the site, at the bottom of the slope is very wet and is not used to grow crops. This would correlate with the land immediately to the east being within Flood Zones 2 & 3.
3. Whilst there are a number of individual residential properties in the vicinity, the site and area around, particularly to the south and east has a clear rural character with fields being used for crops and pasture. The application site

itself is classified as ranging between Grade 2 (Very Good) and 3b (Moderate) in terms of agricultural land quality. Further to the north and west, this rural character changes to low density residential development within Horton Heath to the north, Boorley Green to the south and Hedge End to the south-east.

Description of Application

4. The application seeks outline consent for the construction of up to 150 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, with vehicle and cycle accesses from Snakemoor Lane, separate pedestrian/cycle access from Botley Road, a sustainable transport hub, public open space and play area, and associated infrastructure and landscaping with all matters reserved except for access.
5. In addition to the standard plans and drawings the application is accompanied by the following reports and technical assessments, some of which have been amended during the consideration of the application. All documents are available on the Council's [website](#):
 - Planning Statement
 - Design and Access Statement
 - Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
 - Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy
 - Ecological Impact Assessment
 - Nutrient Neutrality Assessment and Mitigation Strategy
 - Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
 - Tree Survey & Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan
 - Illustrative Landscape Masterplan
 - Transport Assessment
 - Travel Plan
 - Noise Impact Assessment
 - Air Quality Assessment
 - Archaeology and Heritage Assessment
 - Agricultural Land Condition Report
 - Ground Condition Assessment and Desk Top Study
 - Sustainability and Energy Statement
 - Statement of Community Involvement

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

6. The development has previously been screened against the relevant provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and the Planning Practice Guidance (LPA Ref: V/25/99246). This screening assessment considered whether the proposed development is likely to give rise to significant effects on the Environment.
7. The development is not Schedule 1 development but falls under Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations. The site is not located within a sensitive area as defined by the EIA Regulations, but the proposals exceed the defined

thresholds in Schedule 2 for urban development projects of this nature, thus requiring the proposals to be assessed against the criteria in Schedule 3. For the reasons set out above it is considered that subject to mitigation, the development would not be likely to have significant environmental effects on the application site or its immediate surroundings, nor do the characteristics and location of development indicate that the development is likely to give rise to significant environment effects that warrant an EIA being undertaken.

8. Mitigation measures, which are typical for a development of this type and nature, would be necessary and these are able to be appropriately provided and controlled through the planning application process, including through the use of planning conditions and S106 planning obligations.
9. Accordingly, the screening assessment has identified that significant effects on the environment are not considered likely either alone or in combination with other development and, therefore, it is the opinion of Eastleigh Borough Council as the Local Planning Authority that the proposed development does not constitute EIA development as defined by the Regulations.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

10. Screening has been undertaken to establish whether a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is required. It is considered that due to the type and location of development the proposal would, without mitigation, have a likely significant effect on the Solent Maritime SAC; Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site; and the New Forest SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. An Appropriate Assessment has been completed setting out that mitigation to offset the increase in nitrogen and phosphorus load from the development and the recreation disturbance on Solent Maritime SAC, Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site and the New Forest SPA, SAC and Ramsar would be required. Financial contributions towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy and the Council's interim New Forest Recreation Mitigation Strategy could be secured via S106 legal agreement and the applicant has indicated that they would look to purchase credits from a suitable nutrient neutrality offsetting scheme. Additional mitigation would be required in the form of a construction environmental management plan and sustainable drainage scheme, which could be secured via condition.

Planning History

11. Other than the EIA Screening Opinion referenced above (V/25/99246) and a pre-application for the scheme now formally submitted (Q/24/98539), there is no other record of any previous planning history directly related to this site.
12. However, a neighbouring site on the opposite side of Snakemoor Lane is of some relevance to that proposed (LPA Ref: F/20/87925). Whilst a much smaller site and development for only five new dwellings, the same issues relating to the principle of the development outside the urban edge, accessibility of the location, and its impact upon the character of the area were considered. Initially refused in March 2021, a planning appeal was later

dismissed in July 2022 with the Inspector concluding that the site was not a suitable location for development having regard to the spatial strategy for the Borough (paragraph 17 of his report), lacked appropriate accessibility to public transport and facilities, and the for the impact on the character and appearance of the area (paragraph 26).

Consultation Responses:

13. Comments are summarised and where more than one set of comments has been received the latest comments have been summarised. All consultation responses are available, in full, on the Council's website - [Planning Application: O/25/99534](#).
14. **Planning Policy** - The Council adopted the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 on 25th April 2022. This document now forms the planning policy framework for the borough to 2036.
15. The site is located on the borough's eastern boundary, to the south of Horton Heath. The site is within countryside, as designated in the adopted Local Plan policy S5. It is not located in a settlement gap. Policy S5 sets out the type of development appropriate in the countryside and detailed criteria for development in these uses. This does not include new residential development, apart from on allocated sites.
16. In accordance with revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, December 2024) the Council needs to demonstrate a five-year supply. It was accepted in the recent appeal for Land to the west of Cobbett Way, Botley (APP/W1715/W/24/3350858), that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year land supply, therefore NPPF paragraph 11d applies. The latest five-year housing supply report prepared by Hampshire County Council has a base date of 1 April 2024 and identifies a supply of 4.3 years. These are based on the planning status of sites, discussions with agents, landowners and developers and recent progress on Council schemes. For the purposes of calculating the current position, the revised NPPF (December 2024) requires a 5% buffer. This reduces the supply for Eastleigh borough from 4.3 years to 4.1 years.
17. The Council is at an early stage in the review of the Local Plan. This will consider and identify appropriate locations in the countryside for residential-led development. However, no decisions have been made on the location of development at this stage and the sites presented in the Local Plan review Issues and Options consultation (or submitted since) have no weight in decision making.
18. The site is currently in agricultural use. It is open countryside, away from the settlement edge and with a limited number of properties to the southwest of the site. Site constraints, including the neighbouring woodland SINC restrict the opportunities for links to and from Horton Heath. The site is also not particularly accessible by non-car modes to local services. It is greater than 1,600 metres away from the nearest local or neighbourhood centre which

would create car-dependency. The proposal would therefore be an isolated development, detached from Horton Heath.

19. The proposal is for new residential development in the countryside. This is in contrary to adopted Local Plan policy and would not constitute plan-led development. As the Council does not currently have a five-year housing land supply, the benefits of the proposal need to be weighed up against adverse impacts. Planning Policy consider that the provision of housing, including affordable housing, does not outweigh the adverse impacts of development in this location.
20. **Landscape** – Whilst overall I accept that the LVIA is a fair assessment of the likely landscape and visual impacts, I do not agree that there will be very limited levels of landscape and visual effects. The replacement of an open field with dense housing, laid out in a typically urbanised form cannot fail to have significant and obvious landscape and visual impact.
21. The development of the site would unavoidably introduce urbanising elements into a rural landscape and cause unavoidable harm to the character and appearance of the Countryside. The boundary planting shown on the illustrative landscape masterplan would not be sufficient to protect and enhance the rural setting of Snakemoor Lane. The proposed housing would be an obvious and intrusive element in the scene, and although there is some mitigating planting shown on the landscape masterplan that would soften the development over time, the 5m buffer along Snakemoor Lane will not allow sufficient boundary planting to effectively screen the development.
22. Turning to the submitted landscape masterplan, we would expect deliverable Green Infrastructure (GI) to be prioritised. The landscape plan fails to create sufficient opportunities for deliverable street tree planting. Although the central avenue of tree planting is welcomed, too many other streets are devoid of tree planting to frontages. There is little evidence of connected GI for the benefit of local fauna. The potential adverse impact on the existing SINC and ancient Woodland needs to be carefully considered. There may be increased pressure for access from future residents with the resultant disturbance to local habitats. The suggested outfall swale into the offsite stream to the east requires careful and sensitive design.
23. **Urban Design** – Given the location of the site within the countryside, there is an in-principle objection to this form of development. The following comments are made on the assumption that suitable justification can be made for a departure from planning policy.
24. Whilst the information provided at this stage is good for an indicative concept plan, it is insufficient to assess if a proposal can be integrated successfully into the wider setting. At the very least, a number of cross-sections should be submitted. These sections should show existing and proposed contours, together with the heights of the proposed development. These sections should extend some way beyond the site boundary so that the proposed levels can be assessed in the wider context.

25. A robust tree planting strategy is needed, with all boundaries carefully considered, with an emphasis on creating robust planted edges that will effectively soften the development in wider views.
26. An illustrative arrangement of land uses was submitted in which is established principles for the disposition of housing, open space, access points and linkages for the whole site. In terms of layout, the proposal indicates an approach based on a series of discrete perimeter blocks with potential housing facing outwards and enclosed private garden spaces within each block. This design principle works well and creates a sense of place where the buildings frontage creates a clear, direct and positive relationship with the public realm, such as the open space or the ecologic area.
27. However, further details in terms of height, materials and appearance are required in order to ensure that the development can integrate well within its setting and does not have any unacceptable visual impact upon the surrounding area.
28. **Trees** – The site is comprised of an area of open field, with no trees. However, there are significant trees around the periphery of the site. The woodland to the north and west is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. There are also two very significant field boundary oaks adjacent to Snakemoor Lane.
29. For the most part, because of the nature of the site, there are no tree issues. We have no arboricultural objection to the proposed vehicle entrance on to Snakemoor Lane.
30. However, there are a couple of points to make regarding other access points for pedestrians and cyclists:
 - At a pre-app. meeting, it was made clear that we would likely not support a cycleway through the woodland. We stated that it was theoretically possible to put a link through but would prefer it restricted to a pedestrian route to keep the path to a minimum width.
 - There are no details on lighting or additional features, and how they could impact the woodland.
 - Where the woodland link meets Botley Road is not very well covered in the impact statement, and neither is the footway to the bus stop. Having reviewed Hampshire Highways' consultation response, this will have to be 3.5 metres from the carriage way, which would see significant impact on the vegetation. This has not been addressed in the application.
31. **Ecology** – Having reviewed the Ecology Addendum Report by Ecosupport (July 2025). The information provided has addressed the majority of our outstanding concerns. There will be impacts from this development, however the recommendations in the Ecology Addendum Report are basically acceptable if followed with appropriate management and monitoring.
32. Point 1: A 20 m buffer zone with no public access is acceptable. The six bullet points to reduce recreational impacts are sensible, however they must be

supported by rigorous regular maintenance of the proposed prevention measures (signs, fencing, pet waste removal, and information provided to homeowners).

33. Point 2: The enhancements proposed to support the commuting population of Barbastelle bats are acceptable. The specifications of the proposed lighting strategy which would create dark corridors around the site must not change, as any increases in lighting will not be acceptable.
34. Point 3: The fenced 20 m buffer needs have thorny scrub such as blackthorn and hawthorn next to the fence so that it is impenetrable for people and pets, but still penetrable by wildlife. There needs to be access for maintenance only, so that the woodland edge can be maintained as patchy scrub (needed for foraging Barbastelle bats). The woodland edge must be rigorously maintained so that it does not become all dense scrub and continues to meet the specific conditions required by the habitat condition assessment (for example: Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) is less than 5%).
35. Point 4: The footpath must be a boardwalk due to the ecological requirements of this area. The path is acceptable only if the lighting is wildlife-sensitive bollards with a downward facing hood. These specifications cannot change later in the design process at reserved matters. The footpath cannot be made bigger or not a boardwalk and the lighting cannot be made brighter. The additional management and maintenance requirements of the lighting and the boardwalk must be included in further planning.
36. **Nature Space (Great Crested Newt district licensing)** - The applicant has submitted an Ecological Impact Assessment which determines that great crested newts were unlikely to be present and impacted by the proposed works. This is deemed appropriate. At the reserved matters stage, updated assessments may be needed to reconfirm the likely absence of great crested newts. Should the developer wish to minimise all risk associated with the development and should they not wish to resurvey at the Reserved Matters stage, they can obtain a licence to undertake works at Outline. This would negate the need to resurvey later for the Reserved Matters application.
37. **Natural England** – Objection. As submitted, we consider it will have an adverse effect on the integrity of the New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site from increased recreational disturbance. The impacts are also likely to affect the features of the associated Sites of Special Scientific Interest which underpin the above habitats site designations.
38. Additionally, the application could have potential significant effects on the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Natural England requires further information to determine the significance of these impacts and the scope for mitigation. Further details of the phosphorus mitigation proposals and a revised Habitats Regulation Assessment will be required.

39. **Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)** – The Preliminary Risk Assessment submitted by AIS Ltd provides a desk-based review of the site, including consideration of topography, geology, historical land use, waste and landfill records, radon potential, hydrology and hydrogeology, as well as findings from a site walkover. A preliminary conceptual site model has been developed, which does not identify any potential contaminant linkages. Overall, the risk to human health and controlled waters is assessed as low.
40. We agree with the conclusions of the report and support the recommendation for limited further investigation and the implementation of a discovery strategy to manage unforeseen contamination risks during groundworks. This can be secured by condition.
41. **Environmental Health (Noise)** – After review of the Hawkins Environmental dated 29/05/2025 Noise assessment : Denham's Corner, Horton Heath reference: H4457-NV-v1 and a follow up letter of 07/07/2025 from Gillings Planning, concerns remain regarding the duration of the noise survey undertaken; the level to which the assessment has taken into consideration the expected increase in local traffic associated with the proposed site and nearby sites already under construction; and specifications for glazing and ventilation. Concerns were also expressed regarding the proximity of gardens to the road.
42. **Environmental Health (Air Quality)** – The Air Quality Assessment submitted (Hawkins Environmental, 22/05/2025) Reference H4457-AQ-v3 has been reviewed and clarifies previous queries raised. This demonstrates that the impact of the development on local air quality is negligible. Additionally, we advise incorporating air quality considerations into a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to address potential air quality impacts during the construction phase, including a dust management plan.
43. **Housing** - If this development is supported the site would be a qualifying site for affordable housing provision and in line with our adopted Affordable Housing SPD would need to provide 35%, which would equate to 53 affordable homes based on 150 dwellings overall.
44. We would generally expect the affordable housing mix to be broadly reflective of the total housing being provided on the site and the affordable units to be split 65%/35% between rented and low-cost home ownership. This would equate to 34 homes for rent and 19 homes for low-cost home ownership. The affordable homes should be interspersed within the open market homes.
45. It should be noted that we would expect that the affordable 2-bedroom accommodation would house 4 persons, and the 3-bedroom accommodation able to house a mix of 5 and 6 people. This is to ensure that we can meet the needs of those applicants awaiting housing from our housing register and to provide long-term homes.
46. The proposal within the outline application to provide 40% on-site affordable housing provision (up to 60 dwellings) with a tenure split of 65% affordable

rent and 35% shared ownership exceeds the above policy position and is therefore supported.

47. Whilst we are therefore supportive of the proposed number and mix of affordable housing provision proposed, we have some reservations regarding the location of the site in relation to local amenities/facilities and regular public transport connections. Applicants must have a gross household annual income of less than £55,000 to qualify to join Eastleigh Borough Council's housing register (Hampshire Home Choice) through which affordable rented units are allocated. By nature, households occupying affordable housing units are more likely to be living on lower incomes with local access to facilities and public transport links therefore a key consideration.
48. **HCC Highways** – Further information is still required.
49. Sustainable Travel: Following on from the Highway Authority previously comments, the applicant has reviewed the sustainable mode infrastructure within the vicinity of the site by assessing these via a WCHAR and Healthy Street indicators. Whilst these provide a general overview of the sustainable infrastructure within the vicinity of the site, it is noted that the routes to key facilities and amenities have not been included within the assessment. It is recommended that in any future submission, specific routes to key facilities within the vicinity of the site, along with the distance to these, are identified and assessed (combining the two current approaches), identifying areas of substandard infrastructure where improvements can be provided in accordance with HCC TG10 guidance's, LTN 1/20 or healthy street indicators.
50. For example, Botley Road is subject to 40mph. This is the main route to key facilities such as the local shop and schools. However, there is currently only a substandard footway present, which is not street lit and does not currently cater for cyclists off-carriageway. As this is a main route to key facilities in the vicinity of the site, the Highway Authority would expect improvement to this route, providing both pedestrian and cycle connections which will assist in accommodating mode shift away from the private car.
51. Site Access: Revised plans and information including tracking has been submitted for the site access. However, further tracking information is required to demonstrate that the site access will work and that no overhanging occurs on the southern side of Snakemoor Lane. It also needs to be demonstrated that the proposed widening of Snakemoor Lane to the west of the site access will adequately address concerns raised in the Road Safety Audit.
52. Pedestrian and Cycle Access: Updated plans have gone some way to addressing previous comments. However, further details in relation to the proposed signalised pedestrian crossing over Botley Road are required to demonstrate that it can be constructed in a manner which meets the necessary highway design requirements, including its impact upon the Denhams Corner roundabout, as well as considering pedestrian and cycle links from here to the surrounding area, with onward cycle facilities into Horton Heath being of particular concern.

53. Road Safety Audit: A stage 1 RSA has been undertaken for the site access and pedestrian/cycle connection. This has raised several concerns regarding the proposal. Whilst these appear to have been adequately addressed, the applicant should provide confirmation from the auditor that their proposed changes deal with the safety concerns raised.
54. Travel Plan: Further revisions to the submitted Travel Plan are recommended, together with a request for evaluation and monitoring fees to be provided by the developer.
55. Traffic Impact: The predicted trip rates associated with the development are generally acceptable and the Highway Authority are comfortable that the site access and Snakemoor lane/ Bubb Lane B3342 / B3354 roundabout (once the committed improvement scheme has been delivered) will operate satisfactorily. However, regarding Bubb Lane B3342 / Chalcroft Way roundabout, further scrutiny is required including revisions to the modelling files used.
56. Recommendation: The Highway Authority require further information at this time as mentioned above before a formal recommendation can be provided. If the LPA are minded determining the application, then please contact the Highway Authority for reasons for refusal.
57. **HCC Access Development Officer (PROW)** - The Service would welcome pedestrian links proposed between the site and the public footpaths to the north and east and requests the applicant investigate such opportunities. Paragraph 105 of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to “take opportunities to protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks.” It shall be for the applicant to obtain any necessary permissions and consents to facilitate them.
58. A development of this scale can also be reasonably expected to introduce several hundred new residents to the area, of whom many shall wish to utilise the local PROW network as part of their daily exercise and recreation. The additional footfall shall increase the rate of wear and tear on the footpaths’ surfaces and structures and necessitate more frequent maintenance interventions from the Service. It would not be considered acceptable by the Service for it to be burdened with this greater liability towards the PROW network without sufficient mitigation. Therefore, an S106 contribution should be secured to be paid by the applicant to the Service to go towards the future maintenance and improvement of public footpaths in the vicinity of the site, which could include resurfacing, vegetation cutback and removal of stiles.
59. **Active Travel England** – Points the LPA to Active Travel England’s standing advice.
60. **HCC Flood and Water Team** – The drainage strategy and hydraulic calculations are high level concept assuming 60% impermeable surfaces

within the proposed development area. The calculations demonstrate that based on the assumptions made, the provisional design for the attenuation basin (as shown in the preliminary drainage strategy layout) should provide sufficient storage to contain the design storm and therefore it should be feasible to deliver a suitable drainage scheme for the site. This is considered to be an appropriate level of detail for an outline planning application with all matters reserved. If the proposals are progressed and if a full application is submitted, we would expect to see a detailed drainage strategy, adopting a catchment based approach to the drainage design including consideration of runoff from both permeable and impermeable surfaces in accordance with current standards and best practice guidance.

61. As the design information submitted in the above FRADS document is preliminary / outline design stage, the strategy will need to be updated and refined as the details of the proposed development are progressed. We therefore recommend the submitted document is not considered as an approved document.
62. **Environment Agency** – The Environment Agency has no objection to the proposal on flood risk grounds as submitted. We consider the development acceptable in flood risk terms as it is unlikely to increase flood risk. We therefore consider the proposal acceptable.
63. **Southern Water** – Standard advice provided in relation to sustainable drainage, but no comments provided in relation to foul drainage.
64. **HCC Archaeology** – The archaeological desk-based assessment notes that few archaeological records exist in the immediate area and that archaeological surveys ahead of some other local development did not find much archaeology and concludes that the site has a low archaeological potential.
65. The desk-based assessment concludes that archaeological matters might be addressed through the use of archaeological conditions to include an initial geophysical survey. The results of a geophysical survey are submitted with the planning application.
66. Whilst the geophysics survey report concludes that no definite archaeological remains were identified (para 8.1) I note on the plot of the results some areas of activity that are described as ‘discrete anomalies of uncertain origin’. Therefore, it is possible that these could have an archaeological origin. I would recommend that these anomalies should be subject to some level of follow up trial trenching to establish their origin and if they are of an archaeological origin meriting archaeological excavation provision should be made to mitigate the impact of development through their prior excavation.
67. Accordingly, I recommend that an archaeological condition is attached to any planning permission which might be issued to secure the targeted trial trenching of the anomalies identified as of uncertain origin. I also recommend that a condition is attached to any planning permission to secure the

archaeological investigation of those anomalies should they prove to be archaeological in origin and of merit.

68. **HCC Children Services** – The proposed development of up to 150 eligible dwellings would usually be expected to generate a total of 45 additional primary age children and 32 additional secondary age pupils. This is based on a rounded figure of 0.3 primary age children per new dwelling and 0.21 secondary age children per dwelling which was derived by conducting demographic surveys of developments that have been completed within Hampshire and calculating the average number of primary age children on those developments.
69. The development site is served by Fair Oak Infant School, Fair Oak Junior School and Wyvern College. These schools are full, and a contribution would be sought. However, at this stage, due to the uncertainties surrounding the wider development plans in this area I am unable to provide a full response at this time.
70. **NHS Hampshire & Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board (ICB)** – The proposed development is for 150 dwellings, and this will create an estimated population of 353 new residents within the development based on an average household size of 2.35. The current combined medical centres providing primary care have insufficient capacity and will not be able to absorb the increased patients arising from the proposed development. The only way to mitigate the impact is to increase the physical capacity of the existing surgeries. As such, financial contributions are required towards increasing primary care infrastructure in order to make the application acceptable in planning terms.
71. The applicant's argument that financial contributions should be reduced in relation to those residents moving to affordable housing within the development are noted but respectfully rebutted. The argument made is too simplistic and does not reflect the reality of GP catchment areas. Recent appeal decisions have supported the ICB's approach to calculating contributions on the basis of all dwellings within a scheme.
72. **Southampton Airport** – No comments received.
73. **Ramblers** – No objection subject to drainage improvements to Footpath 719 Fair Oak and Horton Heath.
74. **Botley Parish Council** – Object:
75. Overdevelopment - This proposal constitutes a clear case of overdevelopment in an already pressured area. The scale and density of the development are inappropriate and would significantly alter the character of the local environment, impacting the community's identity and cohesion.
76. Loss of Green Space and Biodiversity - The site in question currently provides essential green space and habitat for local wildlife.

77. Cumulative Overdevelopment - With multiple large developments already approved or underway nearby, the area is at risk of becoming overdeveloped. There is a growing sense among members and residents that local infrastructure — including healthcare, schools, and public services — is being stretched beyond capacity. This application contributes to that imbalance without offering meaningful solutions or improvements.
78. This site is not in the emerging Botley Neighbourhood Plan.
79. **Fair Oak Parish Council** – Object: The proposed site is not allocated for development in the adopted Local Plan, nor is it identified as a preferred site in the emerging Local Plan review.
80. The applicant's transport assessment (ref. section 2.6) inaccurately portrays the site as well-connected. In reality, the only bus service (No. 3) is infrequent and takes approximately 90 minutes to reach Southampton. Other services cited are either non-existent or extremely limited. The site is not within walking distance of essential services, and the development includes no provision for shops, schools, or healthcare facilities, making it car-dependent and unsustainable.
81. The development is expected to generate additional vehicles accessing the site via Snakemoor Lane which is a narrow rural road with poor visibility, bordered by hedgerows and has no pavements. This raises serious safety concerns for both motorists and cyclists. The anticipated traffic volume would significantly increase the risk of accidents and endanger both drivers and pedestrians.
82. The development would urbanise a rural landscape, causing irreversible harm to the character and appearance of the countryside. This is contrary to policies aimed at protecting rural settings and would set a precedent for further encroachment into greenfield land.
83. **Durley Parish Council** – Object: The site is not identified as a housing site within the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan and would result in a large housing development on the village boundary. Snakemoor Lane is a narrow rural lane, and the development would generate major traffic implications in terms of vehicle movements and highway safety. The lane is not suitable for use by pedestrians or cyclists.
84. The development would result in the loss of agricultural land, impact wildlife and habitats. It would change the rural character of the area which is already under pressure from other nearby developments. Local infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the additional demand, particularly drainage. Local flooding issues will be exacerbated.
85. The proposed development is out of keeping with the rural character of Durley and will be an eyesore when entering the village.

86. **Winchester City Council** – Shares concerns of EBC officers in relation to landscape impact, ecology and trees. Concerns in relation to foul drainage capacity in the locality have also been raised.

Representations Received:

87. Comments relevant to the determination of the application have been summarised. All comments are available, in full, on the Council's [website](#).
88. A total of 90 representations were received directly by the LPA, all objecting to the application on the following grounds:
- Site is not allocated for development
 - Overdevelopment of the area
 - Out of keeping with the rural character of the area
 - Loss of countryside/green space
 - Landscape and visual harm
 - Impact on ecology, biodiversity habitat and protected species
 - Impact on Scoreys Copse
 - Increased traffic and congestion
 - Highway safety concerns
 - Poor visibility along Snakemoor Lane
 - Snakemoor Lane is narrow and not suitable for pedestrians or cyclists
 - Noise & air pollution
 - Inadequate drainage
 - Flooding concerns
 - Increased pressure on local facilities
 - Loss of agricultural land
 - Loss of amenity to existing local residents
 - Loss of privacy
 - Devaluation of property
89. Where appropriate a response to the main issues raised is included below.

Designations Applicable to Site

- Outside the urban edge
- Within catchment area of Solent and Southampton Water SPA and SAC and River Hamble SAC
- Within Solent Recreation Disturbance Zone
- Within New Forest Recreation Disturbance Zone
- Adjacent to Flood Zones 2 & 3
- Adjacent to woodland TPO
- Adjacent to SINC
- Adjacent to Ancient Woodland

The Development Plan

90. At the current time the Development Plan for the Borough comprises the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (October 2013), however the Minerals and Waste Plan is not relevant to this application.

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

91. The relevant policies are:

- S1 – Delivering sustainable development
- S2 – Approach to new development
- S3 – Location of new housing
- S5 – New development in the countryside
- 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 and watercourse management
- DM8 – Pollution
- DM10 – Water and wastewater
- DM11 – Nature conservation
- DM13 – General development criteria – transport
- DM14 – Parking
- DM24 – Creating a mix of housing
- DM28 – Delivering affordable housing
- DM29 – Dwellings with higher access standards
- DM30 – Internal space standards for new residential development
- DM33 – Provision of recreation and open space facilities with new development
- DM36 – Community, leisure and cultural facilities
- DM38 – Funding infrastructure

Supplementary Planning Documents

92. Relevant documents are:

- Affordable Housing (December 2023)
- Biodiversity (December 2009)
- Environmentally Sustainable Development (March 2009)
- Planning Obligations (July 2008)
- Quality Places (November 2011)
- Residential Parking Standards (January 2009)
- Trees and Development (April 2022)

Other documents

- EBC's Public Art Strategy 2023-2028

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

93. At a 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 NPPF 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.
94. The three identified dimensions of sustainability should 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 appropriately responds to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas.
95. The NPPF also states that development proposals which accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out-of-date planning permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of the development would outweigh the benefits; or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. The NPPF requires that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. In other words, the closer the policies in the plan accord to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given.
96. Additionally, the NPPF requires a deliverable five-year supply of housing within each local authority area. If this is not demonstrated a tilted balance in favour of sustainable development applies.

Planning Practice Guidance

97. 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.

Policy Commentary

98. 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.

99. Section 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 (policies detailed above) unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
100. The relevant policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to: the relevant planning policies and the principle of development; the detailed matters for consideration at this stage, i.e. accessibility and access; together with a brief assessment of the reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping based on the information currently available. Additionally, other issues of impact upon the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area; impact upon trees, nature conservation and biodiversity; environmental sustainability; parking and highway issues; local infrastructure, drainage; and any impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties will also be considered.

Key Planning Issues:

Planning Policy

101. Policies S1, S2 and S3 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan set out the approach to sustainable development and its location, which aims for as much development as possible to be located in existing urban areas. Policy S5 relates to the countryside and sets out the type of development that would be supported in principle, including development through the re-use and replacement of existing buildings. The policy does not support new build residential development in the countryside, other than in specific circumstances (e.g. for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople), or on allocated sites. The proposal would therefore be in direct conflict with Policy S5.
102. Also of particular relevance to that proposed are Policies DM1 which covers various issues relating to ensuring development is appropriate to the nature of the site and context of the surrounding area, as well as being of a suitable quality of design; DM11 relating to nature conservation; and DM13 which covers various aspects relating to transport matters.

Principle of Development

103. Based on the requirements of Policy S5, that proposed is not acceptable in principle, being for the construction of up to 150 dwellings outside the urban edge which are not related to any of the types of residential development deemed appropriate by the policy. As such, the application is not supported by the Local Plan. However, as has been set out in the response from Planning Policy, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year land supply as required by the NPPF. In that instance a presumption in favour of sustainable development applies as set out by paragraph 11d of the NPPF. This involves granting permission unless any adverse impacts 'would

significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits' when taken as a whole, or there is a strong reason for refusing the development due to policies 'that protect areas or assets of particular importance' (as listed in NPPF footnote 7).

104. The Council's latest published Calculation of Five-Year Housing Land Supply (November 2024) concludes that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing supply of deliverable housing sites, with the latest housing supply figures demonstrating 4.3 years supply. For the purpose of calculating the current position, the revised NPPF (December 2024) requires a 5% buffer to be applied. This reduces the supply for Eastleigh borough from 4.3 years (as set out in the five-year supply report) to 4.1 years. As such the tilted balance of paragraph 11d) of the NPPF in favour of the sustainable development applies.
105. Notwithstanding the need to apply the tilted balance, this does not mean that the requirements of Policy S5 do not need to be met or that the policy as a whole does not carry any weight. The NPPF also requires planning decisions to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and for developments to be sympathetic to local character. Policy S5 as well as being locational is also concerned with the impact of proposals on the character of the area. There is, therefore, consistency between the NPPF and Policy S5 in respect of the importance of the character and appearance of the area and countryside.
106. Looking more specifically at the application site, there are a number of concerns regarding the suitability of developing the site, notably in relation to its location divorced from existing settlements, the visual impacts on the countryside and character of the area and concerns about accessibility, all of which are covered in more detail where relevant below, but in summary it is not considered that the benefits of the proposed development would outweigh the adverse impacts.

Sustainable Development

107. The NPPF is a significant material consideration when assessing planning applications and section 2 of the NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, which can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
108. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three over-arching objectives – economic, social and environmental (which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways) that should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of policies in the Framework.
109. Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so, should take local circumstances into account to reflect the character, needs and opportunities

of each area. Each of the three dimensions of sustainable development is considered below.

Economic Sustainability

110. Section 2 of the NPPF, when discussing economic sustainability, seeks to 'help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure'. The proposal would result in the provision of open market and affordable housing thereby supporting the population and local economy of the Borough, as well as providing employment during construction.
111. In contrast to these benefits, development of the site would result in the loss of good quality agricultural land which is regularly used for growing crops. However, it is acknowledged that only a portion of the site is graded as high quality land meaning that in the planning balance this does not carry significant weight.
112. It is considered therefore that the proposed development would have economic benefits which outweigh the disbenefits that should be considered in the planning balance. Overall, it is considered that the development would be economically sustainable. However, it should be noted that the general economic benefits arising from the proposed development would equally arise from a similar development in a different and more acceptable location.

Social Sustainability

113. Chapter 5 of the NPPF 'Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes' states that, 'it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay'.
114. The proposed development would provide up to 150 open market and affordable dwellings via a mixture of detached, semi-detached, terraced and bungalow properties. It is proposed that 40% of these would be affordable homes, split 65:35 in favour of affordable rent, equating to 35 and 25 units respectively. The provision of affordable housing at higher than the 35% policy requirement is a significant benefit in favour of the application. However, the concerns regarding the suitability of the site for a housing development and its accessibility, particularly to those who may not have access to a private vehicle are considered to weigh against the benefits of providing a greater level of affordable housing.
115. The NHS Hampshire & Isle of Wight ICB were consulted on the application and commented that the current medical centres providing primary care in the locality have insufficient capacity and would not be able to absorb the increased patients arising from the proposed development. Similar concerns

have been expressed by members of the public. As such they have requested that a financial contribution towards primary care infrastructure is secured should planning permission be granted, to provide the appropriate mitigation for the increase in demand for local primary care facilities. The applicant has not confirmed if they are willing to provide the contributions requested, although without suitable mitigation there would be a wider negative impact upon local primary care provision.

116. On the proviso that the required financial contributions are secured, it is considered that the proposed development would have social benefits in terms of the provision of general market and affordable housing that should be considered in the overall planning balance. However, again, it should be noted that these benefits are not unique to this scheme and could be accrued from a development of this type and size in a different and more acceptable location.

Environmental Sustainability

117. There are a number of different components to Environmental Sustainability, including consideration of site-specific planning matters and the impacts of the development on its surroundings, which are considered below under the relevant subheadings.

Accessibility

118. In addition to development of the application site being contrary to Local Plan policy, the other main area of concern is the accessibility of the site. Whilst it is acknowledged that the northern edge of the site is not far away from the southern tip of Horton Heath and the designated urban edge, the two are separated by a significant piece of woodland with no clear physical or visual link between the two. Indeed, the site is shielded from Horton Heath and the main Botley Road by woodland, meaning that it does not feel part of Horton Heath to the north, but more part of the approach into the village of Durley to the east of the site.
119. Presently access to the site is from Snakemoor Lane along its southern edge. There is a PROW through the woodland to the north, but as has been highlighted in the response from the Eastleigh Ramblers, this is often flooded or too wet to use, so would not at present be a suitable alternative route for everyday use. Access to the PROW is from Botley Road at a point where there is no footway, no lighting and relatively poor sightlines, which again raises questions as to its suitability as a regular route into Horton Heath from the application site.
120. Snakemoor Lane itself is a relatively narrow undulating and sinuous unlit rural lane edged by steep banks and high hedging and lacks any form of footway or grass verge which could be used by pedestrians. Neither is there the room to provide one. This continues along much of the length of the lane to the east with no footway until the reaching Durley at the junction of Stapleford Lane. Equally, there is no form of footway to the west all the way to the Denhams

Corner roundabout. Even here, the footways are on the opposite side of the roundabout. As such, Snakemoor Lane is not considered in anyway suitable for pedestrians and there are equally strong concerns as to its suitability for cyclists, particularly during the hours of darkness.

121. In order to address these obvious issues, it is proposed that two alternative access points to the site are created: a cycle only access in the south-east corner onto Snakemoor Lane; and a shared pedestrian and cycle route through the woodland to the west of the site to Botley Road. Whilst the cycle access point to the south-east would negate the need to use the section of Snakemoor Lane immediately to the south of the site, it does not overcome the concern of cyclists having to use the lane, given the section of lane eastwards into Durley and onwards through to Bishops Waltham is equally poor. It would also not in reality be possible to prevent pedestrians from using the access should they choose to do so.
122. The western route through the woods would remove the need to use Snakemoor Lane but itself raises a number of concerns, not least in relation to potential impact upon trees and biodiversity habitat (see below). The route through the woodland would lead to a signalised pedestrian crossing point which would provide a safe crossing point to the existing footway along the western side of Botley Road. As part of these works a combined footway/cycleway would be provided on the eastern side of Botley Road to the existing bus stop and on to the roundabout, where an enlarged traffic island would be installed to allow cyclists to cross towards Bubb Lane. Hampshire Highways have reviewed the most up-to-date design for these works, and their comments are included below.
123. Whilst it is acknowledged that there may be scope to address some of the technical engineering issues highlighted, this only provides improvements in and around the proposed Botley Road crossing point, it does not address the generally poor quality pedestrian and cycle provision in the wider locality which would need to be used in order for future residents of the development to access local facilities such as shops, schools and public transport.
124. The closest shop to the site is a small convenience store attached to a petrol filling station in Horton Heath approximately 800 metres away from the proposed Botley Road crossing point. In order to access this on foot from the site, pedestrians would need to use the proposed crossing point; walk north along the narrow footway on the western side of Botley Road; before crossing back over to the eastern side of the road to access the filling station, which is primarily designed to allow vehicles to manoeuvre rather than prioritising pedestrians. The next nearest set of shops are in the centre of Fair Oak, 2.4 km to the north along Botley Road, albeit the choice available here is fairly limited. Botley village centre is approximately 4.0 km to the south and includes a similar range of shops as are found in Fair Oak, although is not considered suitable for pedestrian access due to the road there lacking any footways and lighting for much of its length. Similarly, Bishops Waltham approximately 6.5 km to the east is again not considered suitable for pedestrian or cycle access due to the nature of the route and distance.

125. The more realistic destination therefore for general and convenience shopping would be Hedge End approximately 4.0 km away to the south via Bubb Lane and Tollbar Way. Here there is the town centre, or more realistically the large supermarkets to the west of Hedge End which are a similar distance away. Whilst it would be possible to walk or cycle, the distance is likely to be considered too far for most and the route is along busy main roads.
126. The nearest schools to the site are Durley Primary School, approximately 1.5 km to the east along Snakemoor Lane: Fair Oak Infant and Junior Schools, as well as Wyvern Secondary School 1.6 km to the north via Botley Road. There is also Boorley Park Primary in Boorley Green and Berrywood Primary in Hedge End, both approximately 2.4 km away but accessed via busy roads not considered suitable for pedestrians, particularly children.
127. In terms of public transport, it is acknowledged that there is a north and southbound bus stop on Botley Road which would be easily accessible from the application site if the proposed route through the woodland and signalised crossing were provided. However, these are only served by an hourly service (Bluestar Route 3) which runs between Eastleigh and Southampton City Centre. There is also a morning and evening service to Swanmore College in Bishops Waltham, but this is only available to students. Whilst both Eastleigh and Southampton bus stations will allow onward travel to other destinations, the time taken to get to either from the application site is unlikely to be a convenient alternative transport option.
128. The site is in relatively close proximity to Hedge End Railway Station, which is between 1.6 and 1.8 km away depending on which route is taken: Shamblehurst Lane or Bubb Lane. Shamblehurst Lane is a very narrow unlit country lane with no form of footway or grass verge for pedestrians. It is more likely therefore that the route along Bubb Lane and via an unlit footpath which runs parallel to the railway line or through a housing estate would be used. Local trains through to Eastleigh, Winchester and Fareham are available from here and onward to London Waterloo and Portsmouth Harbour.
129. Whilst it is accepted that the distance and access to Hedge End Railway Station is not unreasonable and would provide options for traveling to nearby cities such as Winchester, Southampton and Portsmouth, other public transport options to more local destinations are very limited. The suggestion as part of the proposals for the provision of a cycle hire scheme is noted, however, no details of the operator, how the scheme would be funded and managed, or whether such a scheme would be viable given there are no such schemes locally – the closest being within Eastleigh town, or Southampton city – have been provided. Whilst such a scheme would be supported by the LPA, it is unlikely that there would be sufficient population within the development or within existing nearby development to allow such a scheme to be successful in the long term. Even if some form of cycle or scooter hire scheme were feasible, the concerns highlighted above with regards to the suitability of local roads for cyclists, particularly those who do not cycle regularly would remain.

130. With regards to walking, although the proposed crossing point would provide access to the existing footway along Botley Road and Bubb Lane, neither of these routes are particularly attractive or ideal for parents with pushchairs, or people with mobility buggies or wheelchairs due to their narrow width and the need to cross busy roads.
131. Whilst the site is relatively close to the urban edge and existing residential development, it is not considered to be in the most accessible of locations. This is principally due to the most realistic options in terms of the type of local facilities most would want or need to use are at a distance which is beyond that which most would find convenient to choose to walk to. This together with the poor cycle and local public transport provision is very likely to mean that future residents of the development would be left with little option but to use their car for reasons of safety as well as convenience. This would be contrary to Policy S1 e) which states "To be sustainable, new development in the Borough should: ... e. minimise the need to travel longer distances and, where travel is necessary, prioritise more sustainable forms of transport, such as active travel, other alternatives to car use, or a combination of active travel and other alternatives to car use". This alone is considered to make the proposed development of the application site unacceptable and sufficient as a justified reason for refusal.

Access

132. Separate to the accessibility of the site, Hampshire Highways have reviewed the proposals for the physical works required in order to provide pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access to the site which is the only detailed matter for consideration at this outline stage.
133. Whilst in principle no objection to providing vehicular access to the site from Snakemoor Lane has been raised, questions remain as to whether the design and position of the proposed access will meet the Highway Authority's requirements in terms of tracking, particularly for larger vehicles. Equally, questions remain as to the various alterations which would be required to the Denhams Corner roundabout as a result of providing a signalised crossing point over Botley Road and dedicated cycle provision towards Bubb Lane. It has not been demonstrated that these alterations will meet the necessary standards for a safe cycle crossing point and that the works can be undertaken without effecting traffic flows around the roundabout. Whilst these unanswered questions remain, the Highway Authority is unwilling to support the highway works associated with the development.
134. The lack of support from the Highway Authority is a concern. Whilst it is not being suggested that an acceptable highway scheme cannot be achieved, presently the applicants have not demonstrated that their currently suggested solution is acceptable. As such, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development will accord with the requirements of Policy DM13 which states that "Access arrangements to the highway network must: meet national and local guidance and standards with all highway improvements

meeting the standard required to be adopted by the Highway Authority; not cause or increase danger to road users or have a significant detrimental impact on the operation or safety of the highway network; and be provided without unacceptable environmental impact.”

135. It goes on to state that “All new development must have safe and convenient access to the highway network and make provision for access to, and by, other transport modes including public transport and cycle and pedestrian routes as appropriate.” The concerns relating to site accessibility has been discussed above. These concerns and the questions remaining as to the ability to provide the highway improvements required to serve the development mean that it has not been demonstrated that the requirements of Policy DM13 have been met and this will form a further reason for refusal.

Reserved Matters:

Layout

136. Whilst site layout is a reserved matter, the illustrative masterplan submitted appears to demonstrate that the 150 units proposed can be accommodated in a reasonably comfortable manner even after the land required for ecology buffers and SUDS infrastructure has been taken into account.
137. The layout shown generally follows good urban design practice through the use of loose perimeter blocks with building frontages rather than vehicle parking dominating the street scenes. This has partly been achieved through the use of parking courts which do appear to have scope to include reasonable levels of soft landscaping and tree planting to lift the quality of the spaces. Enclosure of the central open space and play area is provided to the western side and to a reasonable extent to the east, although this is less successful to the north. This open space is linked to a larger area of less formal open space to the eastern sloping side of the site by a tree lined avenue, which is supported in design terms. However, scope for similar street tree planting elsewhere in the layout is relatively limited.
138. Although there are areas within the layout which require further thought, such as the arrangement of dwellings in the northern and north-western corners, together with the eastern edge of the housing which fronts the main open space and SUDS features, and the main site entrance from Snakemoor Lane, the indicative masterplan is a not unreasonable solution as to how the development could be accommodated on site.

Scale

139. The indicative masterplan suggests that the majority of dwellings would be two storeys in height and of a reasonable internal floor area above the minimum standards set out by Policy DM30 of the Local Plan. Some larger two and a half storey dwellings and a number of single storey bungalows are also included. In general terms there is no design objection to dwellings of this

scale provided their appearance in terms of form and materials is appropriate for the nature of the surrounding area.

Appearance

140. No real indication of materials or elevational treatment has been provided at this stage, although it would be expected that any more detailed proposals put forward are reflective and respectful to the nature of the surrounding locality. This need not be a 'traditional' pastiche but rather something with well-considered proportions and use of materials to complement the nature of the site's immediate surroundings.

Landscaping

141. Looking at proposed site landscaping, as opposed to landscape impact, as with the layout, in principle there are no significant objections to the illustrative masterplan provided. Whilst elements such as the tree lined avenue and central open space are welcomed, other opportunities for deliverable street tree planting appear to be limited. Given the nature and character of the site's immediate locality, it would be expected that any site layout is landscape led, including incorporating green infrastructure deeper into the site in order to connect it with its surroundings. There may well be scope to achieve this, but it has not at this stage been clearly demonstrated.

Other Matters:

Landscape Impact & Area Character

142. The application is supported by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which has been reviewed by the Council's Landscape Officer. Whilst it is accepted that the LVIA is a fair assessment of the likely landscape and visual impacts of the development, the LPA do not entirely agree with its conclusion that there would be limited levels of landscape and visual impact.
143. It is acknowledged that the site is relatively well screened and not easily visible from longer range views due to a combination of topography and existing woodland. However, simply because it is not easily visible from more distance vantage points does not mean that development of the site in the manner proposed will not result in harm to the character and visual amenity of the locality. Developing a currently open agricultural field into a housing estate laid out in a typical fashion will introduce an urbanised form of development which will sit in stark contrast to the site's current character and that of its immediate surroundings. This dramatic change in character will be clearly experienced from Snakemoor Lane, particularly when travelling west where the upward slope of the application site is clearly presented in front of you. No level of additional tree or landscape planting will be sufficient to hide the built form of dwellings sitting at the top of the slope, even with the backdrop of the neighbouring woodland. Views into the development will be clearer still at the position of the site access which would not benefit from the current boundary hedge which runs along the lane.

144. As has been discussed above, whilst relatively close to Horton Heath and the urban edge, the application site itself is visually divorced from existing development in Horton Heath due to the intervening woodland. Equally, the site is also not obviously connected to Durley either physically or visually. As such, that proposed would appear as a separate standalone development of a form and scale which is entirely out of context with the prevailing character of the immediate surrounding area. Such a dramatic change from attractive rural landscape to urban housing estate would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity and character of the locality contrary to Policies S5 and DM1 which requires new development to take appropriate account of the context of the area, minimise or suitably mitigate harm and ensure that development in the countryside avoids adverse impacts on the rural character of the landscape. This, together with new residential development outside the urban edge not being supported by Policy S5 will form the main reason for refusal.

Trees

145. Whilst the majority of the site is an area of open field, there are significant trees around the periphery of the site. The woodland to the north and west of the site is subject to a Tree Preservation Order, and there are two very significant field boundary Oaks along Snakemoor Lane. Due to the nature of the site, there are no tree issues, or any arboricultural objection to the location of the main vehicular entrance onto Snakemoor Lane.
146. However, there are some concerns relating to the proposed new access through the woodland to Botley Road. At a pre-application meeting it was made clear that whilst the provision of a pedestrian route was theoretically possible, the provision of a cycleway would likely not be supported due to the increased width and construction required. No details of the exact route, its construction, lighting or any additional features required has been provided, or how these could impact upon the woodland both in terms of trees and ecology.
147. There are also concerns relating to where the woodland link meets Botley Road. Limited arboricultural information has been provided in respect of this. Based on the highway requirements for any cycleway to be set back from the carriageway by 3.5 metres, this would likely see a significant amount of vegetation having to be removed, which would impact the appearance and character of this section of Botley Road.

Ecology

148. Initially the Council's Ecologist raised concerns that development of the site would cause unacceptable pressures on the adjacent SINC's (Scorey's Copse (Ancient Woodland) and Scorey's Copse Rush Pasture), the stream to the east of the site and the nearby SINC's (Scorey's Copse Meadow and Snakemoor Farm Meadow) due to recreational impacts, impacts from pets and lighting, as well as potential nutrient enrichment due to pet wastes, trampling of and changes to ground flora, creation of informal paths, collecting

fallen wood for den building and fires, and fly tipping of garden waste. Additionally, they were also concerned that lighting and loss of foraging habitat as a result of the development would harm Barbastelle bats, which are classified as a vulnerable protected species.

149. However, following additional work by the applicants, the initial ecology objection has now been removed. Albeit this is on the very strong assumption that the management and monitoring recommendations contained within the revised Ecology Addendum Report by Ecosupport (July 2025) are adhered to in full, as set out in the Ecology Officer's response above.
150. Notwithstanding the revised no objection response, there remain some reservations as to whether the recommendations set out can realistically be followed in full.

Protected Species

151. Barbastelle bats were recorded among the assemblage of bats of at least County importance using the site. Barbastelles are among the rarest Annex II species of bats and classified as a vulnerable species in Great Britain by IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature). They use deciduous woodland, wet meadows, streams and rivers for foraging for insects, so loss of this habitat and the resulting decrease in the population of the specific moths that make up their narrow diet would have a detrimental effect on this species. Barbastelles are a light-avoiding species and the additional lighting that a development of 150 homes would bring to this site would have a negative effect on this population. Although street lighting can be controlled, there is no real way to control the additional lighting that homeowners could add to their houses and gardens. As such, the recommendations within the revised ecology report in relation to lighting and maintain dark corridors would need to be rigorously managed.
152. In addition to bats, site surveys have shown that there are badger sets in the vicinity. The presence of setts and badger activity will need to be monitored as they are also a protected species.

Biodiversity Net Gain

153. The application is required to meet the statutory requirement for a 10% biodiversity net gain and the statutory metric submitted with the application provides a 41.12% increase in area habitat units and a 31.75% increase in hedgerow units. Much of the existing habitat on the edges of the site would be retained. While there would be a small loss of woodland habitat to provide the proposed Botley Road access, this would be mitigated by enhancement of other woodland habitat. New habitat would also be created around the site periphery within the buffer zones between development and the adjoining woodland. If the application was to be permitted, any significant habitat (of medium or higher distinctiveness) would need to be secured for 30 years and monitored, with a habitat management and monitoring plan (HMMP) and a s106 agreement to secure monitoring fees.

Nutrient Neutrality

154. Natural England has advised that the increase in wastewater from new housing developments within the Borough is having a detrimental effect on the quality of water entering the Solent catchment area through nitrification. As such, all development for additional housing is required to reach nutrient neutrality (ensuring that development does not add to existing nutrient burdens), in order to meet the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The application site currently has no foul drainage connection and is located between the catchment areas for two different wastewater treatment works – Chickenhall Lane or Peel Common. Depending on which of these treatment works would be used to serve the development will affect the level of mitigation required to achieve nutrient neutrality for nitrates and potentially phosphates. At this stage no indication has been provided by the applicants as to what new foul drainage infrastructure will be required to serve the development or how they intend to address the need for mitigate for the impact of the development and achieve nutrient neutrality. This will therefore form part of a further reason for refusal relating to mitigating impact upon the Solent SPA.

Recreational impacts on the Solent SPA and New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites

155. The site is located within the 5.6km Solent Mitigation Disturbance Zone associated with the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) and the 13.8km catchment zone for the New Forest SPA, SAC and Ramsar site in relation to recreational disturbance. In accordance with advice from Natural England, a net increase in housing development within these catchment areas is likely to result in impacts to the integrity of these sites through an increase in recreational pressure / disturbance.
156. Natural England have objected to the application on the grounds that they consider the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar site from increased recreational disturbance; and that the impacts are also likely to affect the features of the associated Sites of Special Scientific Interest which underpin the above habitats site designations.
157. They reached this view on the basis that they consider the Council's interim strategy to be an unproven mitigation approach that has a significant level of uncertainty regarding its effectiveness at avoiding recreational impacts on the New Forest designations. As such they advise it would not be currently possible to conclude no adverse effects on the integrity of the New Forest designated sites through an appropriate assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, 2017 (as amended).
158. The Council is aware of Natural England's concerns about the interim strategy. However, as the competent authority determining the application, the Council maintains its position that the interim New Forest Recreation Mitigation Strategy does provide sufficient and appropriate mitigation such that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar site.

159. Notwithstanding the differing views of the Council and Natural England, the applicant has not confirmed how they would secure the necessary mitigation to address the impact of increased recreational pressure upon the Solent and New Forest sites. As such, this will form a further reason for refusal.

Highways & Parking

160. As is set out above, together with further detail within their consultation response, the local highway authority require clarification on a number of points relating to the site access, the proposed signalised crossing and alterations to the Denhams Corner roundabout, and how these together with the increase in trips associated with the development will impact traffic flow and the local road network. Without these final points of clarification, the highway authority does not feel that they can fully comment on the impact of the application proposals. As the application currently stands, this lack of additional information required will form a reason for refusal.
161. In terms of parking, whilst the illustrative layout provided is not fixed, it does demonstrate that adequate parking to meet the Council's recently superseded 'Residential Parking Standards' SPD could be provided through a combination of on-plot driveways, shared parking courts and some frontage parking on street. The number of dedicated visitor spaces does appear to be below standard; however, most visitor parking could be accommodated on the carriageway.
162. When assessed against the recently adopted parking standards (September 2025), a number of the dwelling units would not provide sufficient spaces when assessed against fully allocated parking provision. However, this is principally due to garages no longer being counted as a parking space for the purposes of the new SPD. Whilst not meeting the latest requirements, this could easily be rectified by removing the garages or utilising carports instead. As such, the development would generally accord with the requirements of Policy DM14 relating to parking.

Drainage & Flood Risk

163. Whilst parts of the site within the application redline are within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the majority of the site and all of that which would be developed for housing is located in Flood Zone 1 where there is a low probability of flooding. A sustainable drainage strategy has been submitted and reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, neither of whom have raised an objection. Although a much more detailed strategy will be required for any reserved matters or full planning application, it appears possible to ensure that the final SUDS scheme can meet the requirements of Policy DM6 relating to sustainable surface water management and watercourse management.
164. The adequacy of the existing foul drainage system in the locality has been raised as a concern by a number of those objecting to the application. Indeed,

within Appendix D of the supporting Flood Risk and Drainage Strategy there is a copy of correspondence from Southern Water confirming that there is currently inadequate capacity within the local network to serve the development. However, Southern Water did not highlight this in their consultation response to the LPA, instead providing no comment in relation to foul drainage at all. Southern Water were asked to clarify the situation in this regard, but no further response was received.

165. Notwithstanding the concerns raised by objectors, Southern Water have a duty to ensure sufficient capacity is available for new developments, subject to payment by the developer for any improvements or new infrastructure required. It would therefore be unreasonable to refuse the application in relation to concerns about foul drainage.

Noise

166. Whilst no formal objection has been raised by the Council's Environmental Health team on the grounds of noise, a number of criticisms of the submitted noise impact assessment have been raised in relation to the duration of the noise survey undertaken, the sources of data used, and a failure to take into account the impact of building regulation requirements upon the final glazing design and specification.
167. Notwithstanding the issues highlighted, there is nothing to suggest that noise, in particular traffic noise, is likely to have any detrimental impact upon the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development, albeit conditions would likely be required as part of any planning approval requiring further details to be provided and surveys to be undertaken.
168. Reservations have also been raised regarding the proposed site layout, specifically those plots backing onto Snakemoor Lane and how the gardens of these dwellings may be impacted by traffic noise. To entirely overcome this issue would require turning the effected plots around 180 degrees, which would have obvious ramifications for the remainder of the site layout. However, whilst accepting that noise within gardens is an issue which would need to be addressed, the layout proposed is at this stage is indicative and not therefore fixed. As such, there is scope to review the site layout to address the issue or look at alternative solutions such as acoustic fencing or bunds, provided these would not have any further visual impact upon Snakemoor Lane.

Air Quality

169. The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area and it is not considered that there would be a significantly detrimental impact on air quality arising from the anticipated traffic levels as a result of the proposed development or in combination with development already approved and anticipated in the coming years. As such there is no requirement for any mitigation in relation to the occupation of the development. However, Council's Environmental Health team have recommended that a Construction

Environmental Management Plan be secured should permission be granted to ensure appropriate controls are in place during construction to minimise any impacts.

Contaminated Land

170. The Council's Environmental Health team were consulted with regard to land contamination and raise no objection to the application subject to conditions relating to unexpected contamination and importation of soils being attached to any permission granted.

Residential Amenity

Existing Neighbours

171. Objections in relation to privacy, noise and air pollution (discussed above), as well as devaluation of neighbouring properties have been received. Whilst the potential devaluation of property is not a material planning consideration, the impact of that proposed upon the residential amenity of existing neighbours in relation to loss of privacy, light and outlook is.
172. Concerns have been raised by occupiers of the two nearest properties – 'Lane End House' and 'Lane End Stables' – that the proposed dwellings along the western edge of the site would result in overlooking of their properties. Whilst these concerns are acknowledged, the nearest elevations of the proposed dwellings shown on the submitted masterplan are at least 25 metres from the site boundary and approximately 40 metres away from the nearest of the two neighbouring dwellings. This would more than exceed the 22-metre minimum distance between facing windows set out in the Council's 'Quality Places' SPD, so would not in planning terms result in any level of unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy. Whilst it is acknowledged that the masterplan provided is indicative and may not reflect the final layout of any subsequent reserved matters or detailed planning application, the need to retain an acceptable level of privacy for existing neighbours would be a consideration.
173. As to other amenity issues of light and outlook; the distances from existing neighbours and scale/height of development proposed would not result in any reduction in light; and whilst views from these neighbouring properties would be dramatically altered were the application site to be developed, there would be no unacceptable loss of outlook in planning terms.

Future Occupiers

174. Whilst accepting that the masterplan layout provided is indicative, as has been mentioned above, all dwellings shown appear to meet or exceed minimum space standards. All have generally good size gardens, although some north facing gardens do seem to be shorter than the standards set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD, but this could be addressed with some relatively minor alterations to the layout. Distances between facing elevations also appears to meet the necessary SPD requirements, meaning that acceptable levels of privacy and outlook should be achievable.

175. Notwithstanding the concerns in relation to traffic noise highlighted by Environmental Health, the information submitted demonstrates that a good quality of residential amenity should be possible for the 150 dwellings proposed. However, this would need to be tested further should more detailed proposals come forward.

Sustainability and Climate Change

176. 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 Environmental Emergency Action Plan – Update June 2020.
177. 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.
178. Policies S1, DM2 and DM3 of the Local Plan require new development to be sustainable in terms of resource use, climate change and energy use. The application is accompanied by an 'Sustainability and Energy Statement' which set out various possible measures and solutions which could be used to enhance energy efficiency and contribute to minimising the impacts of climate change. In principle there is no objection to the recommendations and suggestions put forward in this supporting statement, but it lacks any definitive proposals and does not really suggest anything more than is currently required through building regulations or by adopting good industry practices. However, it is acknowledged that this is an outline planning application and that it would be unreasonable for the LPA to insist upon these details being provided at such an early stage in the design process.

Human Health

179. Human health relating to ground conditions, noise and air quality has been considered and subject to conditions relating to contaminated land, noise standards and construction methods being attached to any permission granted it is not considered that there would be any other significantly harmful impacts on human health.

Conclusion on environmental sustainability

180. As an outline application it is acknowledged that many more detailed aspects remain uncertain, albeit the information submitted in support of the application relating to aspects such as layout, form and scale, drainage, etc demonstrates that in principle these issues could be appropriately dealt with at a later design stage. However, a number of important issues remain, such as the suitability of the proposed design of the site access design, the Botley Road crossing point and alterations to the Denhams Corner roundabout and how all these would impact local traffic. Without further clarification on and assessment of these issues, it is not possible to confirm that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect in these respects. Whilst this level of uncertainty remains it would not be prudent to consider granting planning approval.
181. Notwithstanding there may be scope to address these outstanding highway issues and overcome the concerns of the Highway Authority, this would not overcome the fundamental issue of the harm the proposed development would have upon the attractive rural character of the locality, or the poor accessibility of the site by alternative and more sustainable means of transport. Whilst various solutions have been suggested by the applicants, such as car and cycle hire schemes, there is no certainty that such schemes would be viable or could be retained for the lifetime of the development. The level of physical works also required to provide basic access to the site and onward to local destinations also demonstrates how poorly located the site is, again with no guarantee that all these required works could be delivered within a reasonable timescale. It is for these reasons that the application is not considered to be environmentally sustainable.

Planning Obligations / Considerations

182. In accordance with the guidance contained within the NPPF, Policies DM13, DM28, DM33, DM38 and E5 of the adopted Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, the Council's 'Planning Obligations' SPD and the requirements of 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. This is in addition to the requisite on-site provision of affordable housing.
183. Contributions / obligations towards the provision of the following infrastructure, community and environmental facilities or mitigation measures have been identified as being required if permission were to be granted:
- 35% Affordable Housing;
 - Community Infrastructure;
 - On and off site Public Open Space and Play Provision;
 - Sustainable Transport;
 - Off-site highway works

- Travel Plan;
- Provision of mobility hub;
- Public Art;
- Education;
- Health Provision;
- Public Right of Way improvements;
- Biodiversity Net Gain monitoring;
- Nitrates and/or phosphate mitigation; and
- S106 monitoring fees.

184. No specific projects or the final figures required have been identified, however, it will be ensured that projects identified for contribution expenditure will comply with the 3 tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy 2010, in that the monies would go towards the projects which are directly related to the development and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. The contributions would be index-linked to ensure the contributions rise in line with the costs of providing the identified projects/measures. The obligations sought are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and to meet the needs generated by the new residents and the potential impact on existing services and facilities.
185. No detailed discussions in relation to planning obligations have been undertaken given the LPA's intention to refuse the application. However, should the applicant wish to appeal the decision, the LPA would be willing to discuss what contributions would be required and how they would be secured. Notwithstanding, given no contributions have been secured, this will form a further reason for refusal.

Equalities Implications

186. Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. It states: -
- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
187. When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups.
188. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

189. With the lack of a five-year housing land supply the tilted balance set out in paragraph 11d) of the NPPF is engaged. As such it is necessary to consider whether any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF 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.
190. Weighing in favour of the application is that it would provide a not unreasonable contribution to the Council's housing requirements, including a higher than policy requirement of affordable housing – 40% as opposed to 35% - together with planning obligations towards local facilities and infrastructure. Additionally economic benefits associated with construction jobs and ongoing support of the local economy by new residents of the development would also result. However, these are benefits which would be achieved as part of any new housing development in a different and more acceptable location.
191. Of neutral weight is the potential for localised infrastructure improvements, such as the Botley Road crossing point and cycle provision, as well as biodiversity and habitat enhancements. However, the infrastructure improvements are primarily required to serve the development itself, so will be of little benefit to the wider community, and the habitat enhancements are a necessary requirement of ensuring the development achieves the national requirement of 10% biodiversity net gain, albeit it is accepted that proposed would provide a greater level of enhancement. Notwithstanding, these enhancements are on the strong proviso that the existing and new created habitat is appropriately managed and maintained.
192. Whilst these benefits are noted, it is not considered that they would outweigh the disbenefits of the scheme which are the impact upon the character of the site and the surrounding area, together with the site's poor accessibility.
193. Although it is accepted that the development would not be obviously visible from more distance vantage points due to topography and woodland, the dramatic change in character from agricultural field to a housing estate would be clearly evident from Snakemoor Lane and the surrounding public right of way. Introducing an overtly urban development into what is currently an attractive rural landscape. The fact that the development would not and cannot be physically linked to any existing urban development would only add to the sense that the development would be an isolated stand-alone scheme which is entirely out of keeping with the prevailing character and nature of its surroundings.
194. The physical isolation of the site from nearby existing settlements and the need for substantial new infrastructure to link to non-car transport routes, which it is still not concluded would be acceptable to the local Highway

Authority, is a further concern which weighs against the application. The practical difficulties of providing the new infrastructure required, together with the inadequacy of existing pedestrian and cycle routes to local facilities and services is a significant concern which it is not considered the development can reasonably overcome, and which would be of detriment to future residents of the development, particularly those within affordable housing who are less likely to have access to a private vehicle.

195. As such, it is judged that the adverse impacts of the scheme outweigh the benefits. Therefore, the application is considered to be contrary to the relevant policies of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) and the provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024); and is recommended for refusal for the reasons set out above.