

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/25/100361

Site Address: QUOB STORE BUNGALOW, ALLINGTON LANE, WEST END,
SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3HQ

Case Officer: Dorothy Hei-Tung-Hoh

Description: Construction of 1no. detached two-bedroom bungalow within the side garden of Quob Store Bungalow

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
Outside of Built-up Area Boundary Within Designated Countryside Tree Preservation Orders		
Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐

- Z/27955/001 - Erection of cattery, stable and garages - 25/04/1985
- Z/27955/004/00 - Use of workroom as a shop for the sale of flowers and shrubs and construction of car park - Permit - 13/02/1989
- Z/27955/005/00 - Erection of detached house, garage and store - Refuse Planning Permission For - 05/02/1990
- Z/27955/006/00 - (Outline) Erection of dwelling - Refused - 15/05/1990
- Z/27955/007/00 - Use of workshop as a shop selling flowers and shrubs - Permit - 10/01/1991
- Z/27955/008/00 - Construction of stable block to include two stalls and dry food store - Refuse Planning Permission For - 10/11/1992
- Z/27955/009/00 - Construction of stable block to include two stalls and dry food store and new vehicular access - Permit - 15/01/1993
- Z/27955/010/00 - Construction of two storey rear extension to dwelling and conversion/ extension of existing outbuilding (cattery) to provide double garage, stables and store. - Permit - 03/12/1993
- Z/33825/000/00 - Conversion of stable to dwelling with alterations to access. - Dismissed - 18/12/1997
- Z/27955/011/00 - Construction of stable block to include two stables, dry feed store and toilet - Permit - 06/02/1998
- Z/27955/012/00 - Change of use from flower shop to storage and distribution of pet foods - Permit - 10/09/1998
- Z/33825/001/00 - Change of use of stable block to chalet bungalow and external alterations. - Refuse Planning Permission For - 29/05/2002
- O/12/71357 - Outline: Erection of office with associated car parking, following demolition of existing buildings (access, scale and layout only) - Refused – 30/11/2012 (Appeal Dismissed – 27/09/2013)
- J/15/77084 - Prior Notification: Change of use from B8 (storage & distribution) to C3 residential dwelling - Prior approval granted - 06/11/2015
- F/16/78330 - Construction of two bedroom bungalow, following demolition of existing outbuilding - Permit - 31/05/2016
- F/16/79715 - Construction of 1no. 2 bed bungalow, following demolition of existing outbuilding (amendment to F/16/78330) - Permit - 06/02/2017

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☐	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	No comments received.		
Parish Council:	No comments received.		

Ecologist:	The Council's Ecologist has advised that the site lies within an amber impact risk zone for great crested newts and within an area with records of protected species in the wider vicinity. Insufficient ecological information has been submitted to allow a full assessment of impacts on protected species and biodiversity.
Tree Consultant:	The Council's Tree Consultant has reviewed the proposal and advises that there are no arboricultural objections in principle. Any potential indirect impacts arising from construction activities could be mitigated, subject to the submission and approval of a Tree Protection Plan in accordance with BS5837:2012, if the application were to be approved.
HCC Highways:	Hampshire County Council Highways raised initial comments in respect of access and parking arrangements, including the need for clarity regarding the site access and vehicle manoeuvring.
Environmental Health:	Environmental Health has raised no objection in principle. However, it has advised that conditions would be required in respect of land contamination investigation and remediation, and the submission of a noise assessment due to the site's proximity to Allington Lane, should the application be approved.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: 20 th November 2025.		

Policy: National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance Development Plan: The <u>Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036</u> The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1 and S5; and Development Management policies DM1, DM11, DM13, DM14, DM26, DM30. Supplementary Planning Documents: Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards

Assessment: <u>Site context and surroundings</u> The application site comprises part of the residential curtilage (side garden) of Quob Store Bungalow. It is located to the south-west of the host dwelling and comprises a roughly trapezoidal area of land. The site lies close to the junction of Allington Lane and Quob Lane, within an area characterised by sporadic residential and agricultural-related development. To the south and south-east of the site lies open land. The site is not within the defined urban edge and falls within the countryside designation. The surrounding pattern of development, together with the presence of intervening open land, contributes to the rural character of the area. <u>Proposal and Background</u> The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of one detached two-bedroom bungalow within the side garden of Quob Store Bungalow. The proposed dwelling would be single storey in form and would include a small front entrance porch, with internal accommodation comprising two bedrooms, a living room, bathrooms and

kitchen facilities. The principal private amenity space would be located to the west of the proposed dwelling. The proposal also includes associated parking and access arrangements, with vehicular access to be taken independently and not shared with Quob Store Bungalow.

Prior to the submission of the current application, the applicant sought pre-application advice in respect of a similar proposal for a new dwelling within the side garden of Quob Store Bungalow. A formal pre-application response was issued, which assessed the principle of introducing a new residential dwelling at this location, alongside other material planning considerations.

The current application represents a formal submission following that pre-application advice. Having reviewed the submitted plans and supporting information, the proposal is materially the same as the scheme previously considered at the pre-application stage, with no substantive changes to the scale, siting, or overall form of development. The only notable alteration relates to the inclusion of a small entrance porch, which does not materially alter the nature of the proposal.

Policy and Principle

The application site lies outside the defined urban edge and within the countryside, where policies seek to strictly control new development. In this regard, the proposal has been assessed principally against Policy S5 and Policy DM26 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036), which together establish a general presumption against new residential development in the countryside unless specific criteria are met.

In addition, the proposal has been considered against Policy DM1 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), which requires all development to be appropriate to its location in terms of scale, form, design and impact, and to demonstrate sustainable patterns of development.

Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036) also stipulates that the Borough Council will work with statutory and voluntary agencies and developers to; protect, conserve and enhance areas subject to international, national and local nature conservation designations, and promote the net gain of biodiversity on all sites through the protection, enhancement and connection of existing provisions and new habitats and features compatible with the native biodiversity characteristics of the Borough.

National planning policy, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), has also been taken into account. The NPPF promotes sustainable development and recognises the need to direct new housing to appropriate locations, while also seeking to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Assessment

- ***Principle of Development***

The primary issue for consideration is whether the principle of introducing a new residential dwelling at this location is acceptable, having regard to the site's countryside designation and the relevant development plan policies.

The application site lies outside the defined urban edge and within the countryside, where development is strictly controlled under Policies S5 and DM26 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036). These policies seek to protect the character and openness of the countryside and strongly restrict new residential development in the countryside, unless it falls within specific and clearly defined exceptions.

The current proposal seeks permission for the erection of a new, detached two-bedroom dwelling within the side garden of Quob Store Bungalow. It would result in the subdivision of the existing residential plot and the introduction of an additional,

independent dwelling in a countryside location. The proposal does not relate to agriculture, forestry, or any other appropriate rural use, nor does it involve the replacement of an existing dwelling. Accordingly, the development does not fall within any of the forms of development supported in principle by Policies S5 or DM26.

Planning history is a material consideration in the assessment of the proposal. In 2012, outline planning permission for the erection of a rural office building on the land was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal (ref. O/12/71357). In reaching that decision, the Planning Inspector concluded that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, noting that it would replace a collection of modest rural buildings with a more consolidated and urban form of development, resulting in an increased degree of urbanisation that would be at odds with the site's rural surroundings. This appeal decision confirms the sensitivity of the site and the importance of resisting forms of development that would erode its rural character.

In 2016, planning permission was granted for a two-bedroom bungalow following the demolition of a disused outbuilding (ref. F/16/78330), later amended under ref. F/16/79715). That permission was justified on the basis of a valid fallback position, established through a prior approval (ref. J/15/77084), which permitted the conversion of the existing outbuilding to residential use under permitted development rights. In that specific context, the approved dwelling was considered an appropriate replacement form of development, and the scheme was assessed as resulting in an improvement to the visual character of the site.

The circumstances of the current application are materially different. The proposal does not involve the replacement of an existing building, nor is there any applicable fallback position. The land is now in use as a residential garden associated with Quob Store Bungalow, and there is no policy basis to support the creation of an additional dwelling in this location. The proposal would therefore introduce a second residential unit within the countryside, where such development is only supported in exceptional circumstances, none of which apply in this case.

While it is acknowledged that the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and that additional dwellings make a positive contribution to overall housing provision, the benefit arising from a single new dwelling would be limited in scale. The site is located in an isolated countryside location with limited accessibility to facilities and services other than by private car. In this instance, that modest benefit would not outweigh the harm arising from the unjustified introduction of new residential development in the countryside, contrary to the objectives of Policies S5 and DM26 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036).

The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable in principle.

- ***Layout, design, and impact upon the character of the area***

The proposed dwelling would be single storey in form and of a modest scale, with a simple design approach and a layout that is typical of a small bungalow. In isolation, the scale and appearance of the building are not considered to be inappropriate.

The proposed siting would position the new dwelling within the side garden of Quob Store Bungalow, resulting in the subdivision of the existing plot and the introduction of a second residential unit. While the layout provides adequate internal accommodation and private amenity space for the proposed dwelling, the form of development would nevertheless represent an additional encroachment of built development into the countryside.

The surrounding area is characterised by a sporadic pattern of development, interspersed with open land, which contributes to the rural character of the locality. Although the design of the proposed dwelling is modest, its introduction would alter the

established pattern of development by introducing an additional built element within what is currently a single residential curtilage. The proposal would therefore contribute to a more domestic and suburban form of development within a countryside setting.

In this context, the harm identified does not arise from the architectural design or scale of the proposed building itself, but from the nature and form of development proposed at this location. The introduction of a new, independent dwelling within the countryside would erode the rural character of the area through an increased level of residential development over time, when considered in the context of the site's countryside setting.

- ***Impact on residential amenity***

The proposed dwelling would be located within the side garden of Quob Store Bungalow, between the host dwelling and the neighbouring converted residential unit at Arkenfield Stables.

Having regard to the separation distances shown on the submitted plans, the single-storey nature of the proposed dwelling, and the absence of first-floor windows, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy or undue overlooking to adjacent residential properties. Similarly, given the modest scale of the building, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to an overbearing or oppressive impact or result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight to adjoining dwellings.

The proposed dwelling would be provided with a dedicated area of private amenity space, which would be sufficient to meet the day-to-day needs of future occupiers. While the site is relatively constrained and the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the site boundaries would be relatively close, the single-storey nature of the development and the orientation of windows are such that it would not give rise to unacceptable harm to living conditions.

Overall, the proposal is not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers or future residents.

- ***Ecology***

The application site lies within an area with the potential to support protected species. The Council's Ecologist has been consulted on the proposal and has reviewed the submitted plans and supporting information.

The Ecologist has advised that the site lies within an amber impact risk zone for great crested newts, with a pond located approximately 230 metres to the north of the site and records of reptiles, amphibians, bats and badgers in the wider area. In such circumstances, sufficient ecological information is required to enable the Local Planning Authority to fully assess the potential impacts of the proposed development on protected species and other ecological features.

The Ecologist has confirmed that insufficient information has been submitted with the application to allow an informed assessment of ecological impacts. In particular, further clarification is required in respect of the extent of existing vegetation on site, including the submission of a site plan and photographs showing all areas of vegetation that may be affected by the development. In addition, the information submitted in relation to biodiversity net gain is incomplete and inconsistent. While the applicant has indicated that the proposal would be exempt from the mandatory requirement to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain, no biodiversity metric has been submitted to verify this position, and the biodiversity gain plan provided does not accord with the Council's local validation requirements. As such, the Local Planning Authority is unable to confirm that the proposal would achieve no net loss, or where possible a net gain, for biodiversity.

In the absence of this information, the Local Planning Authority cannot conclude that the proposed development would not result in adverse effects on protected species and other ecological features on or in the vicinity of the site, nor that it would accord with local and national biodiversity policy requirements.

The proposed development would result in a net increase in residential accommodation and population. In the absence of appropriate mitigation measures to offset the impacts of additional recreational pressure and nutrient loading, the Local Planning Authority cannot conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of European protected sites. No mitigation strategy or financial contributions have been submitted with the application to address recreational disturbance or nutrient neutrality. As such, the Local Planning Authority is unable to conclude that the proposed development would comply with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

- ***Environmental Health (Land Contamination, Air Quality and Noise)***

The Council's Environmental Health Team has been consulted on the application and has reviewed the submitted information in relation to land contamination, air quality and noise.

In respect of contaminated land, the Environmental Health Team has advised that the site is not located within an identified contaminative land use and that radon risk is low. However, it is noted that a poultry farm is located to the north of the site and that historical aerial imagery indicates that the site has undergone several changes in recent years, including clearance of vegetation and use for car parking. In light of the proposed residential end use, the Environmental Health Team has advised that the development would be acceptable subject to conditions requiring the investigation and assessment of potential land contamination and, where necessary, the implementation of appropriate remediation and verification measures prior to occupation.

In relation to air quality, the Environmental Health Team has advised that the proposal does not constitute a major development and is unlikely to give rise to significant air quality impacts during either the construction or operational phases. Nevertheless, it is advised that best practice measures should be adopted to minimise any potential impacts on local air quality.

With regard to noise, the Environmental Health Team has identified the site's proximity to Allington Lane and has advised that a noise assessment would be required to assess potential impacts from traffic noise, including during night-time periods, and to identify any necessary mitigation measures to achieve acceptable internal and external noise levels.

The Environmental Health Team has confirmed that the matters identified above could be addressed through the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions. However, as the Local Planning Authority is recommending refusal of the application for other planning reasons, it has not been necessary to secure these conditions as part of the current application.

- ***Trees***

Due to the presence of significant trees on or adjacent to the site, the Council's Tree Consultant has been consulted on the proposal and has reviewed the submitted information.

The Tree Consultant has advised that there may be potential indirect impacts arising from construction access and associated activities. However, it is noted that such impacts are relatively easy to mitigate, and that the site is already laid to scalplings. On this basis, the Tree Consultant raises no arboricultural objection to the proposal, subject to the imposition of an appropriate pre-commencement condition.

In the event that planning permission were to be granted, a condition would be required to secure the submission and approval of a scaled and referenced Tree Protection Plan in accordance with British Standard BS5837:2012 (Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction – Recommendations), prior to the commencement of any excavation, demolition or development-related works.

- ***Highways and parking***

The proposal has been considered in highway terms, and the HCC Highway was consulted on the original submission.

The Highway Authority raised no objection in principle to the proposed development, subject to amendments being made in the interests of highway safety. In particular, the Highway Authority advised that improvements would be required to the visibility splay to the left when exiting the site, through setting the boundary fence back a minimum of 2.0 metres from the carriageway edge. It was also requested that any gates be set back a minimum of 6.0 metres from the back edge of the carriageway, and that the initial length of the driveway be hard surfaced to prevent loose material migrating onto the highway.

These matters were subsequently raised with the applicant, and a revised block plan has since been submitted which appears to address the Highway Authority's original comments by demonstrating that the fence line would be realigned to achieve the required visibility splay, the gates would be set back 6.0 metres from the carriageway edge, and the initial length of the driveway would be hard surfaced. However, it is noted that the revised block plan has not been formally reviewed by the Highway Authority.

Notwithstanding the above, the proposal would continue to provide adequate on-site parking and turning space to allow vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. In the absence of any outstanding highway safety concerns, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable harm to highway safety.

Climate Change:

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

The declaration of the Climate Change and Environmental Emergency demonstrates a strong commitment from the Council to achieve net zero. The NPPF, development plan and adopted local plan policy do not set this as a specific target, but it is a material consideration to be considered alongside all other material considerations. In any case addressing climate change is a core part of the NPPF and local plan policy. The need to support the economy is part of the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the adopted local plan, as is an assessment of climate impacts. When considering the impact of climate change, the proposed development is expected to be resilient to the potential effects of climate change and is expected to reduce/limit impacts on climate emissions as a result of the development or its use.

Equalities Implications:

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

- A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

Conclusion:

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed development, by reason of the erection of a new, independent residential dwelling within the countryside and outside the defined urban edge, represents an unjustified form of residential development in an isolated and unsustainable location. The proposal does not fall within any of the categories of development supported in principle within the countryside and would result in the inappropriate subdivision of a residential curtilage and the introduction of additional built form, which would erode the rural character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1, DM26 and S5 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016-2036), and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
2. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in adverse effects on protected species and other ecological features on or in the vicinity of the site, or that it would achieve no net loss, or where possible a net gain, for biodiversity. In the absence of this information, the Local Planning Authority is unable to conclude that the proposal would accord with local and national biodiversity policy requirements. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036) and the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
3. The application fails to provide for the required mitigation to offset the impacts of the development on the European protected Solent Complex (SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites), River Itchen SAC and SSSI, and New Forest SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites, from additional recreational pressure and nutrient loading generated by the population increase and additional sewage resulting from the development. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy DM11 of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan (2016–2036), the contents of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), and the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☐

REFUSE ☒