

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: F/24/98419

Site Address: UNIT 20 FIRST FLOOR, CHALCROFT DISTRIBUTION PARK,
BURNETTS LANE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 2PA

Case Officer: Rachael Morris

Description: First floor rear extension to provide additional office space

Particular Site Constraints?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Adjacent to Chalcroft Distribution Park SINC • Adjacent to an existing employment zone • Adjacent to Chalcroft Business Park (policy WE1) • Within the urban edge		

Planning History?	Yes ☒	No ☐
• Z/19636/005/00 - Outline: Demolition of Existing Dwellings, Partial Redevelopment for Commercial Uses B1, B2 And B8 – Refuse – Apr 1995 • Z/19636/006/00 - Outline: Residential Development – Refuse – Apr 1995 • Z/19636/007/00 - Outline: Residential Development – Refuse – May 1996 • Z/19636/023/00 - Ground Floor Rear Office Extension Of 66 Sq Metres – Permit – Nov 2002 • F/04/50047 - Retention of Portakabin Adjacent to Existing Café and Takeaway – Permit – Mar 2004		

Publicity:	Letters ☒	Site Notice ☒	Newspaper ☐
Representations:	None		
Parish Council:	No Comment		
Ecology:	<u>Update (December):</u> I have reviewed the Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme (BES) by the Ecology Partnership (December 2024). The proposals are appropriate. I have no further ecology concerns. <u>Update:</u> I have reviewed the updated Design Statement by Boyle & Summers (November 2024). There will be no external lighting for this extension and no additional footpath so the previous request for a lighting scheme and a footpath plan are no longer needed. The spiral stair will only be used during emergencies so would not have an impact on the SINC. <u>Nov 2024:</u> I have reviewed the Design Statement by Boyle & Summers (September 2024). The proposal will be built in the same footprint, with a spiral fire escape stair extending further to the southwest. The distance from the SINC boundary to the existing extension is approximately 11.5 m. I have reviewed the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by The Ecology Partnership (October 2024). The proposal qualifies for the de minimus exemption from providing 10% biodiversity net gain but biodiversity enhancements are required in accord with Local Plan policy DM 11 and NPPF paragraph 180. As discussed in section 4.12, no roof tiles are proposed to be removed where the new flat roof would meet the existing pitched roof. If anything changes, a bat licensed ecologist will be required to supervise any tile removal. In the unlikely event of any bats being found during demolition or construction, all work must stop immediately, and Natural England must be informed.		

	I don't think the addition of a first-floor extension and a metal spiral fire escape stair will have a shading impact on the SINC boundary however, as recommended in section 4.14 a bat-sensitive lighting scheme will be required so that light from this building (either exterior lighting or interior light spill) does not shine onto any vegetation which might be used by foraging, commuting or roosting bats or nesting birds either on or off site. The lighting recommendations in section 4.14 can be conditioned with no more than 1 lux illuminating any areas which may be used by wildlife. The construction of a new footpath from the escape stair to the front of the building is mentioned in the Design Statement (p. 10) but not shown on the plan. There are trees shown quite close to the building and their root protection zones could be affected by construction of a footpath. A plan showing the route of the proposed footpath, and the root protection zones of the existing trees is required. Is an additional footpath necessary or can an existing footpath be extended? The reasonable avoidance measures for reptiles and best practice guidelines for hedgehogs mentioned in the report shall be implemented. A bat box, a bird box, log piles and hedgehog shelters have been recommended as biodiversity enhancements. Built-in boxes are preferred to externally mounted boxes as they cannot fall off and do not require maintenance. Swift nest boxes can be used by other birds when swifts are not in residence, however the boxes recommended in the report are appropriate. A biodiversity enhancements plan can either be provided before determination or can be conditioned.
Environmental health – Noise:	I refer to the application for an extension to provide additional office space and comment on Environmental Noise Impact. The entire business park is occupied by commercial premises, the nearest Noise Sensitive Receptor are residential dwellings some distance away. Therefore, I have no objections to the application regarding Environmental Noise.
Environmental health – Contaminated land:	The application site is located on land with a former contaminative use and has the potential to have caused contamination. However, the proposed development involves the construction of a first-floor rear extension, with no ground disturbance anticipated. Aerial imagery shows the rear extension was built post 2000s, therefore, asbestos is not anticipated within the building's fabric. In conclusion, we agree with the principle of the development and no have further comments on contaminated land.
Environmental health – Air quality:	The Planning Statement indicates the extension intends to accommodate additional 3 members of staff on regular basis. The new proposed extension will create additional space for 8 or more with visitors' capacity. The Parking and Highways subheadings in section 6 appears to be missing. However, it is noted that the site is served by car park opposite the road. It is not considered a major increase in the number of daily movements. Therefore, we have no further comments on this regard. As there are few residential dwellings to the south-east of the site, we recommend the provision of a CEMP to prevent, control or mitigate any potential environmental impacts during construction works.

Site Visit:	Yes ☒	No ☐
Details: The case officer is very familiar with the site and surroundings due to previous and on-going applications within the Business Park.		

Policy:**National Planning Policy Framework
Planning Practice Guidance****Development Plan:**

The Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 The most relevant policies are Strategic policies S1, S2 and S4; and Development Management policies DM1, DM2, DM6, DM8, DM11, DM14 and DM15.

Supplementary Planning Documents:

Quality Places; Residential Parking Standards; Character Area Appraisals.

Assessment:

The development is considered acceptable and complies with policies DM1, DM2, DM6, DM8, DM11, DM14 and DM15 from the 2016-2036 local plan, in that:

Principle

- The development is within the urban edge where the principle of development is acceptable.
- Policy DM1 states
“All new development should:
 - a. not have an unacceptable impact on, and where possible should enhance: residential amenities of both new and existing residents; the character and appearance of urban areas...
 - c. take full and proper account of the context of the site including the character, appearance and land uses of the locality or neighbourhood, and be compatible with adjoining uses and be well integrated with these in terms of mass, scale, materials, layout, density, design and siting, both in itself and in relation to adjoining buildings, spaces and views. Where adjoining development is poor in urban design terms, new development should contribute to improving the character of the area”
- While the site does not sit within an existing employment zone directly, this site is closely linked to Chalcroft Business Park and does provide employment as an existing use. As such, policy DM15 does have relevance to this proposal.
- Policy DM15 states
“The major existing employment sites shall be retained predominantly in employment use classes B2, B8 and E(g). Within these sites the Borough Council will permit:
 - a. the redevelopment and intensification of use of sites for Use Class B2, B8 and E(g)(ii)/(iii) employment uses;”
- Originally designed as a residential dwelling to serve the wider estate, when in the ownership and operation of the Ministry of Defence, it is now occupied for employment uses. The existing single storey rear extension extends into what would historically been the rear gardens of the property.

Proposal

- The proposed extension would add a new first floor element above the existing ground floor extension to accommodate offices, under use class E(g)(ii), providing an additional 66sqm of space.
- The existing office accommodates approximately 10 people on a daily basis and with the intention to accommodate 3 more members of staff of a regular basis. The proposed extension will provide a new open plan office area for approx. 8 members of staff with capacity for visitors.
- The proposal is to extend the existing office space and not to make a new stand-alone office.

- The proposed use of class E(g)ii is in accordance with policy DM15 for safeguarding employment sites.
- There is parking available on site and within the wider business park such as in the area of hard-surfacing directly opposite the site. In addition, higher levels of sustainable transport will be available with the provision of the One Horton Heath development which is proposed to provide bus services.

Design and layout

- The design of the first-floor rear extension is suited to the host building in terms of its form, scale and appearance which respects the character and appearance of the locality.
- The proposed extension is differentiated from the existing brick with vertical timber boarding. While the proposed extension represents a juxtaposing character of development compared to the existing building, the stark difference displays the extension as a clear addition to the building which helps to retain the existing character of the building while bringing a contemporary feel. The existing building is not of any particular architectural merit.
- The wider site is also experiencing re-development both within the main business park and in the adjacent field to the south-east. The adjacent outline development for commercial floor space and farm shop under planning reference O/23/96467 also proposes similar materials of wooden cladding, as demonstrated in pages 20-22 from the associated Design and Access Statement.
- The extension is proposed with a flat roof which accords with the contemporary style of the development. In addition, the existing single-storey rear extension has a flat roof and as such this proposal retains this existing character.
- The proposed extension would follow the same footprint as the existing ground floor extension. As this is situated to the rear, there are limited public viewpoints, with only glimpses possible from the estate road and from the forthcoming commercial development to the south-east. Nonetheless, the mature treeline to the south will limit long-distance views.
- The proposal is considered to accord with policy DM1 in that it takes account of the character and appearance of the locality while also not following the poor urban design qualities of the existing building. The proposed extension would contribute to enhancing area.

Other material considerations

- The development accords with guidance set out in the 'Quality Places' SPD in that there will be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.
- The use of the as an office is not incompatible with the adjacent residential use, as defined by Use Class E(g) "Uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to its amenity".
- A Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) has been conditioned to protect the adjacent residential properties amenities during construction.
- The proposal is within the de minimis exemption for mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) as the proposal impacts less than 25 sqm of non-priority habitat.
- Due to the footprint of the extension not extending further into the site, the adjacent SINC is not expected to be detrimentally impacted. Nonetheless, the CEMP will require information on how this will be protected during construction.
- There will be no adverse impact upon trees or other natural features worthy of retention.
- There are no likely significant impacts on the SPA.

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 by 2025; (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.

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:

Recommendation:

PERMIT ☒

REFUSE ☐

Comments ...