REF. NO. F/12/70996

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	-	Proposed first floor extension Portswood House, Hampshire Corporate Park Templars Way Chandler's Ford Eastleigh SO53 3YX

SITE VISIT DATE Undertaken by Steve Nangreave at pre-application stage

ARE PLANS ACCURATE – Submitted drawings alow a comprehensive assessment of the development proosed.

HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED – In accordance with the Local Planning Authority's publicity of planning proposals all relevant occupiers of adjacent premises have been consulted.

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above, to provide an additional 715 square metres floorspace to the central projection of the office building. Height to increase from 8m to 14.4m at ridge.
SITE AREA	1.227 square metres.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	n/a
TOPOGRAPHY	General flat site
TREES	None affected by this application
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Mature tree screening
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Predominately 2-storey office building divided into two main blocks, each of which with an internal courtyard. The third, central block is currently a single storey rear extension which houses plant, IT equipment and some meeting rooms. The building reflects the design of the other two office blocks in the Hampshire Corporate Park.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Mixed area of development with residential to the north of Templars Way, an area of commercial development to the southeast and the strategic gap/countryside separating Chandlers Ford from Chilworth to the south.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
Z/16866/003/00	commercial office development	09/08/1982 GRANT OUTLINE PERMISSION
Z/16866/004/00	Outline: Business Park	06/06/1985 GRANT OUTLINE PERMISSION
Z/16866/005/00	Erection of offices with associated parking, landscaping and access road	06/06/1985 Per
Z/16866/008/00	Approval of reserved matters relating to	12/11/1985 APPROVE THE

REF. NO. F/12/70996

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
	outline permission under ref. 16866/4 (dated 6.7.85.) for erection of 2 storey offices with associated access road and car parking, thus discharging conditions 3 (a),(c),(d),(e), (g),(i); 4,5,6,7,8,10,11 and 14.	RESERVED MATTERS
Z/16866/010/00	ERECTION OF OFFICES WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING	25/02/1987 Per
Z/16866/009/00	PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING SPACES,WITH ASSOCIATED PLANTING AND NEW BIN STORE	03/02/1994 Per
Z/16866/020/00	ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL CAR PARKING SPACES	21/11/1997 Per
Z/16866/021/00	AMENDED PARKING LAYOUT TO PROVIDE 13NO. ADDITIONAL SPACES BY REDUCING WIDTH OF BAY FROM 2.40M TO 2.28M	12/04/2000 Ref
Z/16866/023/00	ERECTION OF CYCLE SHED	16/09/2002 Per
F/04/52555	Installation of automatic entrance door	30/12/2004 Per

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
LOCAL GROUP	No comments received
OTHER	

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
Environmental Health	Thank you for consulting this Service on the above application. I have reviewed the information provided / that held by this Service and I would like to make the following comments: .. The proposed development will include extensive work to the existing roof structure; .. The proposed development site is in close proximity to existing commercial properties that are currently occupied. As the proposed development has the potential to impact on the existing commercial properties, I recommend that the following conditions are imposed for amenity protection reasons. Construction Noise The development shall not begin until a scheme of works detailing the measures to be taken to control noise and vibration from 'site activities' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The approved scheme must then be fully implemented and

REF. NO. F/12/70996

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	retained to the satisfaction of the local Planning Authority. NS05 - Hours of work No construction or demolition work must take place except between the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Mondays to Fridays or 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays. NS21 - Dust Developments shall not begin until a scheme of works to deal with dust from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme shall then be implemented and retained to the satisfaction of the local Planning Authority. NS18 - No burning The burning of materials obtained by site clearance or from any other source must not take place without the prior written consent of the local Planning Authority.
Parish	Delegated Decision - No Objection
Engineering	No objection. In regard to the proposed first floor extension, as an existing building (in transport terms) it is acknowledged that the site is generally acceptable in regard to access sight lines and internal layout of parking / delivery / refuse areas. There are however reported issues which an extension could exacerbate. Primarily these are: - Shortage of on-site car parking which results in employees utilising surrounding highways and private car parks (ASDA); and - Access / egress to the site is difficult particularly in the peak hours, with potentially dangerous manoeuvres observed as people try to access/egress across the flow of traffic. In regard to the car parking, it is acknowledged that the proposed site occupier (Ageas) is intending to introduce a Travel Plan to (amongst other things) combat single occupancy car commutes and as such this issue should be resolved at least to some extent. I would not necessarily wish to see additional spaces constructed which could increase car use to site accordingly. In regard to the access, this is currently via a simple priority junction. Particularly in the peak hours when turning right in or out of site, it involves an often over accelerated vehicle movement to try and speed through a ‘gap’ in traffic - a gap that is often insufficient - in order to get across the heavy vehicular flow. As such, if there is to be an extension to the building, I would expect to see improvements to this junction in the form of a roundabout as part of the development proposals, as an increase in size would be expected to also have an increase in associated vehicle flows. I would consider these works to be essential

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	for the development in terms of highway safety and as such carried out under a S278 agreement with HCC. In terms of transport related Developer Contributions, again, these would be required due to the multi-modal increase associated with an increase in building size. Utilising the Hampshire County Council Transport Contributions Policy, this would equate to a sum of £34,408 (+ indexation). These funds would be allocated to schemes in the local vicinity which are either of benefit to the users of the proposed development, or go to mitigate against issues caused by the development. The primary scheme would be TSI 553, which is the introduction of the roundabout as outlined above. Whilst primarily a required improvement for the proposed extension, it is acknowledged that there will be benefits for the wider network (improved safety being one) and as such in this specific case it would be acceptable for contributions to be waived if the roundabout were to be provided under S278. If this proves not to be the case, then a list of alternative schemes can be provided if required. Applying the 2002 current adopted HCC parking standards, the existing floorspace of 8890 sq m plus the proposed additional 800sq m creates a total of 9690 sq m, which at a maximum parking limit of 1 space per 30 sq m means the development should in theory provide for no more than 323 car spaces. The orginal office development was originally built in 1980s and at that time the parking standards were higher at 1 space per 20 sqm, at the old standards the original development of 8890sqm needed 445 car spaces. The additional development of 800sq m requires 26 spaces, so a total theoretical requirement maximum of 471 spaces is needed. However, past uses of the Corporate Park have resulted in overspill parking out of site on to surrounding residential roads, so it would not be appropriate in my view to seek a reduction from the 480 spaces proposed. As regards access, the developers have now made contact regarding proposed improvements with a mini roundabout configuration instead of the right turning lane and this is currently subject of consultation with HCC. The cycle stores would be better located near the building to encourage cycling, particularly the store nearest Templars Way, but as these are already in existence this can be considered as part of Travel Plan initiatives.
BAA	We have now assessed the application against safeguarding criteria and can confirm that we have no safeguarding objections to the proposed development.

REF. NO. F/12/70996

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	However, we would like to make the following observation: Cranes Given the nature of the proposed development it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. We would, therefore, draw the applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4, 'Cranes and Other Construction Issues' (available at http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-safeguarding.htm

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Existing Employment Site

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 59.BE, 117.E
Pre submission Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 S1, S2, S4, S6, DM1, DM11, DM12, DM23, DM24
Supplementary Planning Guidance : Residential Amenity in the Borough of Eastleigh

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to character, visual amenity and highway safety.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

It is considered appropriate to impose the majority of conditions suggested by Environmental Health, however, with regards to the hours of work; given this is an employment site which generally operates standard working hours, it would seem more appropriate to allow the flexibility of weekend working if necessary, to reduce the impact on nearby commercial properties. The building is sufficiently far from residential properties for this to be less of an issue, and much of the noise generated will be buffered by the existing structure. Due to the protracted discussions on the need for highway contributions or the provision of a purpose designed traffic island at the junction of corporate park access road and Templars Way. On receipt of the appropriate highway contributions May 2013, the majority of the proposed addition has been constructed. Thereby negating the requirement for the environmental protection conditions requested by the Head of Housing and Environmental Health.

The Council's Engineering unit have acknowledged that the existing parking arrangement is acceptable. Their principle concern relates to the inadequate access/egress arrangements to the

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

site. The agent has been presented with two options, either payment of contributions, to be allocated to schemes in the local vicinity which are either of benefit to the users of the proposed development, or to mitigate against issues caused by the development. Alternatively, Ageas could undertake the highway works themselves under a S278 agreement with HCC. Ageas have attempted to reach agreement with HCC regarding the highway works, however they have not been able to and have instead chosen to pay the upfront contributions.

BAA have raised no objection and have only asked for an informative to be included on the decision notice, which can be done.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

n/a

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Ageas have attempted to provide improved access arrangements to the Park, however have been unable to reach agreement with HCC and so have agreed to pay highway contributions.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

> *"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."*

Policy 59.BE of the Local Plan requires development to take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character and appearance of the locality and be appropriate in mass, scale, materials, layout, design and siting. It also requires a high standard of landscape design, have a satisfactory means of access and layout for vehicles, cyclist and pedestrians, make provision for refuse and cycle storage and avoid unduly impacting on neighbouring uses through overlooking, loss of light, and loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

Policy 117.E states that new development for employment purposes within the existing employment sites will be permitted provided they do not conflict with policy on the location of office development.

The relocation of Ageas to this office building does not conflict with policy 117.E. The impact of the proposed first floor extension will be limited due to the mature plant/tree screening around the rear of the site and the height of the two main blocks of the building. The extension is centred between the two wings, therefore not affecting the symmetry of the building and is of an appropriate design for a building of this nature in an existing employment area.

The discussion regarding parking and cycle storage has been laid out in the Engineers consultation response and contributions have been sought to address the highways issue.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than

in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

Recommend permission subject to conditions and receipt of contributions.