MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/13/73826

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Partial change of use of ground floor to D1 (adult substance services) Knight & Polson 18 Romsey Road Eastleigh SO50 9ZH

SITE VISIT DATE	08/04/14			
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?	x	Yes		No. If not why not…….
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?	x	Yes		No. If not why not…….

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above. Service provides a holistic approach to treating substance misuse and is looking to relocate as their current premises at 75 Leigh Rd has become too small.					
SITE AREA	2049 sq.m.					
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	n/a					
TOPOGRAPHY	x	Generally level site, frontage slopes up from Romsey Rd		Sloping …..		Other …
TREES	x	No		Yes, …..		
BOUNDARY TREATMENT		Eastern boundary 1.0-1.2m along frontage stepping up to 1.8m at rear. Western boundary 1.2m fencing at front, 2.0m fencing at rear. 1.0m wall along frontage and open rear boundary.				
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Three storey property, facing onto Romsey Rd and the recreation ground. Hard standing at the front and rear of the property, accessed from Romsey Rd and the rear alley respectively. Last used as solicitors office (B1).					
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Part of Eastleigh Town Centre Urban Renaissance Quarter, buildings surround the recreation ground, separated by the busy Romsey Road and Leigh Road. Buildings on the north side of Romsey Road are typically large, three storey structures.					

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION
F/13/72861	Change of use from office (B1a) to medical and health use (D1)	Withdrawn 9/12/13

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT
11 Weston Rd	On the application, purpose of use it says: D1 adult substance services (details on covering letter), however we cannot see the letter so have no details on what the intended use is.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
HPP	(Verbal communication) No objection.
ENG	No objection subject to disabled parking and contributions. There are no highway alterations proposed in connection with the change of use, and though on-site parking is low, the site is ideally placed for an employment facility, being within a close proximity of bus and rail services, a CPZ (no parking on-street available) and with opportunities for parking in the town centre car parks for those who need to drive. The only issue I have, is in regard to the use of the on-site parking. Whilst the site layout plan shows the availability of 7 spaces (4 front / 3 rear), the design and access statement only make mention of the 4 spaces to the front, these being for staff only. What are the rear spaces for? Onwards from the staff only issue, mention is also made of adjustments to building to cater for disabled users. As such, it can be assumed disabled users will access the site and therefore it it requested that at least two front of site parking may is dedicated to disabled parking to cater for these users - increased on-site if necessary once opened. Without an onsite bay, there is potential for disabled visitors to park on yellow lines in surrounding streets would not be welcomed as a first option. Confirmation of what the remaining 3 rear spaces are for would also be helpful. Additionally, in regard to transport developer contributions, these will be required in line with the HCC Transport Contributions Policy for a change of use that will bring additional multimodal trips to the highway network. This would be calculated as follows, given a mix of estimated information and information supplied as part of the application pack: Proposed Use: 20 staff per day - 40 multimodal trips (in/out with lunch onsite) - outlined on the application form 80 patients per day - 160 multimodal trips (in / out) - estimated figure Total Daily multimodal trips - 200 Employment trip cost - £230 per trip DC requirement = £46,000, less Existing Use: 190sqm of B1 @ standard HCC fee of £4,301 per 100sqm (as per application form / HCC TCP) DC requirement = £8,171.90 Total transport developer contribution = £37,828.10 (+ indexation)

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	These funds would be allocated to schemes in the local vicinity which are either of benefit to the residents of the proposed development, or go to mitigate against issues caused by the develepment. Full details of identified transport schemes can be provided if required, and can be seen in the Eastleigh Borough Transport Statement http://www3.hants.gov.uk/eastleigh-transport-statement-final-2012.pdf In regard to the staff trips, further clarification is required as to whether these staff remain on site all day, or are required to be in and out of the office to cover home visits, etc. If home visitrs, etc. are required, then this would add to the associated trip increase accordingly, and require additional developer contributions. Developers may also wish to supply further information on the exact number of patients anticipated per day, if the estimate of 80 is inaccurate. As Matt comments , it is assumed cycle parking and bin storage could be accommodated within the space available. ********** Revised comments, following receipt of additional information: DISABLED PARKING: It has been confirmed that disabled parking will be located at the front of the property. This should be implemented by condition to ensure it occurs, and reduce potential for obstructive disabled parking to occur on the highway. Condition E06 would cover this, but requires an updated plan that actually shows a minimum of 2 frontage disabled spaces. DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS: As outlined above, in regard to transport developer contributions, these will be required in line with the HCC Transport Contributions Policy for a change of use that will bring additional multimodal trips to the highway network. This have been calculated as follows: Proposed Use: 20 staff per day - 40 multimodal trips (in/out with lunch onsite) - outlined within the application form 25 patients per day - 50 multimodal trips (in / out) - figure provided by developer Total Daily multimodal trips - 90 Employment trip cost - £230 per trip DC requirement = £20,700. However, given that the site is located adjacent to the town centre, it would be anticipated that an element of trips to site would be combined with a linked shopping trip for example. With no information available upon which this could be assessed, I would suggest a notional 33% reduction to accommodate this, that reduces the proposed use figure to

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
	£13,869. Existing Use: 190sqm of B1 @ standard HCC fee of £4,301 per 100sqm (as per application form / HCC TCP) DC requirement = £8,171.90 Total transport developer contribution (proposed less existing) = £5,697 (+ indexation) These funds would be allocated to schemes in the local vicinity which are either of benefit to the residents of the proposed development, or go to mitigate against issues caused by the develepment. Full details of identified transport schemes can be provided if required, and can be seen in the Eastleigh Borough Transport Statement http://www3. (MG 11.04.2014) ********** Having spoken further to the applicant to clarify the exact situation, workings of the proposals, anticipated linked trips / re-assigned trips, etc. the need for developer contributions has been re-assessed. As a result, I can confirm that in this specific case no contributions are required. The need for a minimum of 2 disabled parking spaces on the frontage does however remain to reduce the potential of obstructive parking on Romsey Road. (MG 25.04.2014)
ECP	No comments received
HCAS	No comments received
HPCT	No comments received

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Airport Safeguarding Zone Within Eastleigh Town Centre Urban Renaissance Quarter

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011): 59.BE (Development Criteria), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T. (Parking), 125.TC (Eastleigh Town Centre), 126.TC (Access to Town Centre), 131.TC (Romsey Rd), 186.IN (Community Facilities) Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029 DM1, DM23, DM24, DM35, E7 Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

n/a

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

n/a

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework:

The NPPF carried a presumption in favour of sustainable development (para. 14), which incorporates three elements: economic, social and environmental, (para. 7). Planning law requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, (para. 11). Should a development proposal accord with the development plan, approval should be given without delay, (para.14).

The Framework identifies 12 core planning principles (para.17), one of which states, 'take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs'.

The National Planning Policy Framework highlights that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people, (para. 56) and goes on to state that decisions should aim to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development (para. 58).

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, and character of the area.

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	See below	x	Additional information has been received, as requested by Engineers, to satisfy their queries. The requirement for disabled parking spaces can be covered by condition.

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	See below	x	The covering letter has been received and is available on the website.

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

Following discussions with the applicant and in accordance with the revised Engineering comments, contributions are not sought for this application.

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

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

material considerations indicate otherwise."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

The site is located within the urban edge in the leisure and cultural zone of the Renaissance Quarter. It is located within a high accessibility area, close to the town centre with good pedestrian and cycle links to nearby facilities. Subject to the consideration of the detailed matters, the principle of development is acceptable.

Saved 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, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

186.IN relates to the provision of community facilities within the urban edge, provided they will not adversely affect the residential amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Street scene and character of the area

There will be no changes to the exterior of the building and the parking areas at the front and rear will be utilised for this purpose. There will be no impact on the street scene and character of the area.

Residential amenity

The unit is to be used for the holistic treatment and support of individuals and their families dealing with substance abuse. The use of the service is appointment-only and there is a zero-tolerance on drugs or alcohol found on the premises and congregation around the premises. This service has operated successfully at 75 Leigh Road, near to The Point. The move is required to expand and improve the service provided. There are commercial premises on both sides of the property and it is considered there will be no significant impact on the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

Highway matters

Policy 100.T expects development to be sited close to, or well served by, public transport, cycling and walking. Policy 104.T states permission will only be granted for development that provides adequate off-highway parking provision.

The site is located very close to the Town Centre and both the railway and bus station. Sufficient space is available on site to accommodate staff parking and disabled parking bays. The requirement for disabled parking spaces can be covered by condition.

There is no objection from the Council's Transportation and Engineering unit on highway grounds.

Provision of Community Facilities

The change of use of this unit to an adult substance services facility will provide a community use in an appropriate location within the urban edge, in a sustainable location, without significantly impacting residential amenity. The relocation of the service from 75 Leigh Road will allow for improvements to be made to the service, thereby supporting the core principle within the NPPF to support improvements to community facilities that address local needs.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposed change of use to adult substance services accords with the saved and emerging policies and is consistent with the aims of the NPPF. As such, it is recommended that permission is granted.

REF. NO. «AltRef»

MINOR DEVELOPMENT PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT REF. NO. F/13/73826

DESCRIPTION/ ADDRESS	Partial change of use of ground floor to D1 (adult substance services) Knight & Polson 18 Romsey Road Eastleigh SO50 9ZH

SITE VISIT DATE					
ARE PLANS ACCURATE?		Yes		No. If not why not…….	
HAVE ALL NECESSARY NEIGHBOURS BEEN CONSULTED?		Yes		No. If not why not…….	

THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION						
SITE AREA						
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)						
TOPOGRAPHY		Level		Sloping …..		Other …
TREES		No		Yes, …..		
BOUNDARY TREATMENT		……m high fence /wall/ hedge				
SITE CHARACTERISTICS						
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY						

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

REFERENCE	DESCRIPTION	DECISION

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

SOURCE	SUMMARY OF CONTENT

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTEE	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE
BLKM	

REF. NO. «AltRef»

POLICY CONTEXT

DESIGNATION APPLICABLE TO SITE
Within Strategic/Local Gap Outside/Within Built-up Area Boundary Within Established Residential Area Within Designated Conservation Area Within Site of Ancient Monument Within Site of Archaeological Interest Affects Setting of Listed Building Adjacent/Within Site of Special Scientific Interest Adjacent//Within Local Nature Reserve Adjacent/Within Site of Nature Conservation Interest Listed Building Grade I/II/III OTHER

DEVELOPMENT PLAN SAVED POLICIES, EMERGING LOCAL PLAN POLICIES AND SPD'S

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review (2001-2011) 28.ES (Waste Collection/Recycling), 59.BE
Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029
(Development Criteria), 72.H (Density), 75.H (Density), 100.T (Minimise Travelling), 101.T (Infrastructure Contributions), 104.T. (Parking), 147.OS (Public Open Space), 191.IN (Social Infrastructure).
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Biodiversity
Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations
Supplementary Planning Document: Environmentally Sustainable Development
Supplementary Planning Document Residential Parking Standards

CHARACTER APPRAISAL AREA

Chandlers Ford & Hiltingbury Character Area
Hedge End, West End and Botley Character Area
Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound Character Area
Eastleigh Character Area
Bishopstoke Fair Oak and Horton Heath Character Area

SPECIAL POLICY AREA

The Aviary Estate Special Policy Area
Campbell Road Special Policy Area
Hiltingbury Special Policy Area
Old Bursledon Special Policy Area
Crowsport Special Policy Area
Bournemouth Road Special Policy Area

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

REF. NO. «AltRef»

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies and guidance combine to form the criteria against which this application will be assessed with particular regard to residential amenity, highway matters, trees, nature conservation, street scene and character of the area

COMMENT ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES

	See below		Other……

COMMENT ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

	See below		Other……

PLANNING OBLIGATION/CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with the provisions of Circular 05/05 saved policies 101.T, 147.OS and 191.IN of the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Review 2001-2011 and supplementary planning document. Planning obligation contributions are sought to offset the impact of the development on local infrastructure. For this development contributions are sought towards Community Infrastructure, Sustainable Transport and Public Open Space. The applicant has agreed / not agreed to secure the contributions through a direct payment / unilateral undertaking / Section 106 Legal Agreement.

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."

MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

The site is located within the urban edge and is bound by residential properties. It is located within a low/medium/high accessibility area … and on a bus route, with relatively good pedestrian and cycle links to nearby facilities. The density of this proposal is ….. and subject to the consideration of the detailed matters, the principle of development is acceptable.

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, loss of outlook, noise and fumes.

Layout and design

Street scene and character of the area

Residential amenity

To assist with assessing the impact of a development on neighbouring properties Supplementary Planning Guidance: Quality Places has been produced which gives guidance on over looking, loss of light, amenity space for new dwellings and refuse storage.

REF. NO. «AltRef»

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Highway matters

Policy 100.T expects development to be sited close to, or well served by, public transport, cycling and walking. Policy 104.T states permission will only be granted for development that provides adequate off-highway parking provision.

Trees

Nature conservation

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Also of relevance is the Revised Draft Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2029. While not yet adopted it does carry weight by virtue of being intended as the current local plan's replacement. With regards to this application, the new policies essentially echo those of the current plan and are not considered to affect the recommendation put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

The recommendation is to permit/refuse