

WELLINGTON WAY SHOPPING
CENTRE
WATERLOOVILLE
PO7 7ED

GPDO CLASS AB
SUPPORTING
STATEMENT

FEBRUARY 2023

A

+44 (0)1962 736201

MAIL@ADVOCOPLANNING.CO.UK
ADVOCOPLANNING.CO.UK

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Supporting Statement is designed to explain and support a series of three Prior Notification submitted in accordance with requirements of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2 Part 20 Class AB. This relatively newly introduced provision allow additional storeys to be added to existing commercial buildings to provide new dwellings and is part of a wider Government drive to increase the supply of housing and reviving town centres.
- 1.2 Much of the requisite supporting information is captured by a combination of the completed application forms and the submitted plans, which show existing and proposed elevations and floorplans.
- 1.3 This statement will therefore only explain points which may require further clarification beyond the basic information which is captured through the specific questions set out in the completed application forms. For ease of reference, the structure of this Statement broadly adopts the question numbers as they appear on the forms.
- 1.4 The broad headings are as follows:-
 - Question 4 Eligibility
 - Question 5 Description of Proposed Works, Impacts and Risks
- 1.5 Question 5 further sub-divides into the following areas of assessment; each of which will be addressed under separate headings:-
 - Detailed description of proposed works
 - Transport and highways impacts;
 - Air Traffic and defence assets implications
 - Contamination risks;
 - Flooding risks;
 - Amenity impacts;
 - Noise impacts
 - Impact on existing businesses and trades; and
 - Impact on any protected view.
- 1.6 As previously stated separate Class AB prior notifications in relation to blocks B, C and D are being submitted. This report is submitted in relation to each of these Prior Notifications and therefore if there is an issue which applies only to one of the applications / blocks this will be identified.

2.0 Eligibility (Question 4)

- 2.1 As stated above, commentary is provided only where any explanation beyond that captured in the forms might be beneficial. Accordingly, if there is no specific commentary, please defer to the forms only.

Construction Date

- 2.2 It is understood that the shopping centre was built in two phases which started in the late 1950s with construction completed some 5 years later. The 1960 OS map shows phase

1 of the shopping centre comprising two runs of shops either side of a pedestrian walkway which linked directly on London Road. The 1980s map show the shopping centre complete and in its current configuration.

Qualifying Use

- 2.3 The bulk of the units are in former A1 retail use whilst many are vacant. There are also a small number of former A2 and A3 uses, all of which now falls within new Use Class E and therefore constitute qualifying uses. There are no hot food takeaways which are now classified as sui generis uses and might serve to disqualify the buildings from the Permitted Development rights now sought.
- 2.4 The upper floor currently comprises ancillary accommodation serving the ground floor uses.

Heights and Location of New Works

- 2.5 These are set out in the submitted drawings. No additional storeys have been previously added to the building or new units provided under Class MA of the GPDO.

Designations

- 2.6 The following applies:-
- The site is not on Article 2(3) land;
 - The site is not within a SSSI;
 - The building is not listed or within the curtilage of a listed building;
 - The site does not contain a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
 - The site does not fall within a safety hazard area or a military explosives storage area;
 - The site is not within 3km of the perimeter of an aerodrome
- 2.7 The size of proposed flats, the height increases and configuration of the proposed flats including internal arrangements is shown in the submitted drawings and demonstrates full compliance with Class AB provisions.
- 2.8 Given the above and the other supporting information, it is contended that the Eligibility criteria is fully met.

3.0 Description of Proposed Works, Impacts and Risks (Question 5)

Proposed Works

- 3.1 The following table summarises the three Class AB Prior Notification submissions.

Block	Total Units	1 bed	2 bed
B	15	7	8
C	11	9	2
D	14	12	2

- 3.2 For each scheme, a mix of 1 and 2 bed apartments are proposed, which reflects the opportunity the building presents and the location. Each unit will meet nationally described space standards and provide an appropriate level of residential amenity.

- 3.3 The proposals seek to mimic the existing architectural features of the building by simply replicating the aesthetic and detailing of the lower storeys at the upper level, albeit of a domestic rather than retail proportions.
- 3.4 Requisite bicycle and refuse storage as reasonably required by the development will be located on the ground floor of each block and accessed from the rear of each block.
- 3.5 The submitted floorplans and elevations demonstrate that each apartment will have access to natural light. The GPDO guidance on this issue is clear that no formal assessment is required and therefore a planning judgement based on floor plans and elevations should be made.

Transport and Highway Impacts

- 3.6 The site is located in a highly accessible location close to shops, employment and the amenities typically associated with a town centre site. London Road is pedestrianised but is close to multiple bus routes and, given the proximity to the town centre, both cycling and walking are viable transport options.
- 3.7 A significant proportion of both commercial and residential uses are present in the location and are without allocated car parking. In this location car free living is considered both viable and realistic and would appear to be the norm rather than the exception. In addition, the demand for residential parking, is typically evenings and weekends when the commercial demand for potentially the same spaces is at its lowest. A public car park adjoins the application site.
- 3.8 In these terms there is not considered to be any highway related constraint in what is clearly a highly sustainable location.

Air Traffic and defence assets implications

- 3.9 The application site is beyond the requisite 3km from the perimeter of any aerodrome.
- 3.10 There are no other defence installations which might be impacted by the proposed works. In addition, there are a number of buildings in close proximity to the application site which are significantly higher than the resultant building as proposed would be. In these terms there will be no adverse impacts or enhanced safety risk associated with these assets.

Contamination Risks

- 3.11 The proposals do not require any groundworks or building works which might disturb solid floors or hardstanding areas, nor do the proposals involve the creation or use of soft landscaping areas as gardens or areas where produce might be cultivated. The historic use of the building is for retail use, and there is no known history of any potentially contaminating uses or contamination.
- 3.12 A Contamination Report submitted in relation to a planning application to redevelop the site is also included and, although not designed for the current proposals, continues to provide a robust assessment of any contamination risks.
- 3.13 Based on the above, and the absence of any ground disturbance, it is considered that, even applying the pre-cautionary principle, the risk of contamination is sufficiently low that it may be discounted. Furthermore, if this position is not accepted, any residual contamination risk is sufficiently low that any investigation may be secured via the imposition of an appropriately worded planning condition.

Flood Risk

- 3.14 The site does not fall within any flood risk zone and no changes which would materially add to surface run-off are proposed. Accordingly, there are no flood risks associated with the proposed works.

Amenity

- 3.15 The proposed development comprises an upwards extension above the existing single storey elements of the existing building. As a result of this and given the nature and configuration of adjoining uses and buildings, it will not result in any loss of light, outlook or privacy.

Noise

- 3.16 The site falls within a busy mixed residential and commercial area. The principle of residential uses interspersed with commercial uses is already well established and seemingly occurs without conflict or issue. A Noise Assessment in relation to an earlier planning application on the site provides a suitable assessment of existing noise level and shows that the greatest noise sensitivity relates to Block A which is excluded from these proposals.
- 3.17 The proposed new residential units will be located with a pedestrianised environment with Class E uses below, which by definition are broadly considered to be appropriate uses alongside residential. The principle of flats above retail units within this shopping centre is already established within Block A. Compliance with Building Regulations will ensure that noise transmission between flats is safeguarded. Furthermore, a good degree of separation between the entrance to the new residential units and the retained commercial uses is provided which further limits any impact on noise.
- 3.18 In these terms it is not considered that any undue issue relating to noise and impact on residential amenity will arise.

Impact on existing businesses and trades

- 3.19 This criterion seeks to assess the impact of an additional residential presence on existing commercial uses.
- 3.20 In this regard, the existing shopping centre is run down and has multiple empty units. An enhanced residential presence will improve the appearance of each of the blocks and the shopping centre as a whole. This in turn will add to the retail offer of the town centre. The additional residential units will add to the vibrancy of the area and will add to the customer base for existing commercial and retail uses. An enhanced residential presence in mixed use areas also adds to security by increasing passive surveillance which is a further benefit in an area such as this.

Impact on Protected Views

- 3.21 No such views exist and therefore this is not applicable.

4.0 Habitat Regulations

- 4.1 The applicant acknowledges that development secured through Permitted Development may still be subject to Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations and this may in turn require mitigation. Specifically, a prior approval may be granted subject to the provisions of Chapter 2, Part 6, regulations 75 to 78 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (general development orders). Compliance with the Habitat Regulations would then be required which can follow any Prior Approval or be considered in parallel. Implementation of any Prior Approval consent would be reliant on the satisfactory completion of this further assessment regime.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 Given the above, it is considered that the requirements of Class AB are fully met in each of the three submissions and that prior approval is not required; thereby allowing the proposed scheme to be carried out as permitted development.