
Site Address: Plot 2, Dunsbury Hill Farm, Park Lane, Cowplain,
Waterlooville

Proposal: Approval of Reserved Matters in respect to Plot 2 Phase 1 of outline application APP/15/00732 (new employment uses, hotel and access road) comprising construction of B8 warehouse and distribution building(18,037 sq m) to be constructed in 2 phases, with a maximum height not exceeding the 42m AOD contour (the design for plot 2 incorporating revision to previously approved parameter plan forming part of the Environmental Statement dated March 2012).

Application No: APP/15/01156

Expiry Date: 14/01/2016

Applicant: Portsmouth City Council

Team: Team 2

Agent: Mrs Jones
Peter Brett Associates

Case Officer: Daphney Haywood

Ward: Barncroft

Recommendation: **GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The Dunsbury Hill Farm site (DHF) comprises approximately 20 hectares of land located to the north west of Leigh Park. It lies to the east of the A3M and Junction 3 with Hulbert Road, from which it is separated by tracts of woodland. It lies to the west of Calshot Road, which forms the outer edge of Havant, from which it is separated by narrow tracts of open pasture and hedgerows. Prospect School lies to the south east, along with a recently completed Parchment Place development of 135 Houses. To the south is an area called Nevilles Park, comprising a mixture of woodland, pasture and scrub; much is not publicly accessible but is owned by the applicant. Work has commenced on the access road in accordance with the details approved under application APP/12/00338.
- 1.2 Plot 2 forms part of the first phase of development and comprises 2.672 ha on the southern edge of the DHF site with a direct frontage onto the new access road linking Hulbert Road and Calshot Road. The site which is rectangular in shape is enclosed on 3 sides by mature tree planting, and has a fall in levels across the site of approx. 7m.

2 Planning History

APP/12/00338. Hybrid planning application comprising a part outline application relating to development for employment uses and a hotel with conference facilities and a part detailed application for a new access link road with bus gate to Woolston Road; together with landscaping, infrastructure and associated works. Approved 19-02-2014

APP/14/01000. Partial discharge of Condition A16 of Planning Permission APP/12/00338 in respect to access road only Approved 12-03-2015

APP/15/00270. Discharge of Conditions A1 (i)c and A1 (ii), A17 and A18 of Planning Permission APP/12/00338. Approved 25-03-2015 in respect of link road only

APP/15/00239 Application for Discharge of Condition No's A10, A11, A12, A13, A14 and A16 relating to Planning Permission APP/12/00338. Approved 26-05-15 in

respect of link road only.

APP/15/00478 Discharge of Condition No/s A1, A2, A3, C2 and C3 of Planning Permission APP/12/00338 in respect to the access road only.
Approved 6 August 2015

APP/15/00676 Discharge of Condition Nos. A8, A9 and C2 of Planning Permission APP/12/00338. Approved 6 August 2015

APP/15/00732 Variation of Condition B6 of Planning Permission APP/12/00338 to change the maximum B8 floorspace from 12,356 square metres (20%) to 18,534 square metres (30%). Approved 2015

3 Proposal

- 3.1 Approval of Reserved Matters in respect to Plot 2 Phase 1 of outline application APP/15/00732 (new employment uses, hotel and access road) comprising construction of B8 warehouse and distribution building(18,037 sq m) to be constructed in 2 phases, with a maximum height not exceeding the 42m AOD contour (the design for plot 2 incorporating revision to previously approved parameter plan forming part of the Environmental Statement dated March 2012).
- 3.2 The building would comprise 3 No. 30m wide by 114m long bays and be constructed in 2 phases, with phase 1 comprising 2 of these bays. Car parking for 140 spaces, including 10 disabled spaces would be provide to the front of the building, with the service yard comprising 10 dock levellers and 3 level access loading doors on the eastern elevation. Ancillary equipment and plant such as sprinkler tanks, oil storage, generators and pump would be located on the southern boundary behind the warehouse building.
- 3.3 In line with the design code the front of the site would remain unfenced whilst the remainder of the site would be secured by 2.7m high colour coated paladin security fencing, except where acoustic fencing is proposed along the eastern and southern boundaries adjacent the service yard.
- 3.4 The front of the proposed building would be finished in curtain walling with glazing depicting the office and entrance areas. The main warehouse accommodation would be clad in horizontal curved metal profile cladding in a combination of silver and grey hues.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS13	(Green Infrastructure)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS18	(Strategic Site Delivery)
CS19	(Effective Provision of Infrastructure)

CS2	(Employment)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS3	(Skills and Employability)
CS5	(Tourism)
CS6	(Regeneration of the Borough)
DM1	(Recreation and Open Space)
DM10	(Pollution)
DM11	(Planning for More Sustainable Travel)
DM12	(Mitigating the Impacts of Travel)
DM14	(Car and Cycle Parking on Development (excluding residential))
DM8	(Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of Existing Natural Features)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

Dunsbury Hill Farm Development Brief 2007

The development brief pre-dates the 2011 Local Plan. It provides more detailed guidance on the form of development, and much of this has been included in the Local Plan requirements in policy CS18. The brief therefore has limited weight.

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.

Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Building Control, (Fire Access Consultation)No adverse comments

County Archaeologist No adverse comments

Environment Agency no objection to the proposed application as submitted.

Advice To Local Planning Authority:Flood Risk

The applicant is reminded of the need to provide information on the proposed surface water drainage scheme for the plot as per our previous correspondence as and when appropriate.

County Ecologist

The application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment (v.2, Atkins, November 2015) which provides a robust assessment of the potential ecological impacts of this proposal. The application is supported by detailed ecological survey works stemming both from the previous assessment for the main hybrid application as well as bespoke updating surveys for Plot 2.

The ecological surveys have identified a number of receptors which are at risk of impact from these proposals. Of these, two (bats and hazel dormouse) are European protected species. The recently-confirmed presence of the very rare Bechstein's bat within woodland immediately south of the application site is a significant discovery, yet not unsurprising. Dormouse nests have been found immediately west of the plot and the species can be expected to occur within any suitable habitat locally. The northern boundary supports populations of all four common reptile species.

Reptiles

All four common native species have been recorded on site and a translocation process has been underway since September. All captured animals are being moved into the established Habitat Creation Area to the north – this area is being enhanced with reptile refugia/hibernacula. I am content with the measures in place for reptile

species.

Hazel dormouse

The presence of hazel dormice within the habitat surrounding the plot has been confirmed in 2015 and it must be assumed that this species could occur in any dense woody vegetation, including bramble, in the vicinity. The proposals will result in the loss of c.1000m² of potential habitat (some of this 'temporary') and so impacts to dormice can be assumed. These works will be carried out under a European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence from Natural England, with vegetation cut back in a staged process between winter and early summer.

This development is highly likely to affect dormice, which receive strict legal protection under UK law by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under EU law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (commonly referred to as the Habitats Regulations). Where developments affect European Protected Species (EPS), permission can be granted unless the development is likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive underpinning the Habitats Regulations and is unlikely to be granted an EPS licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law.

Will the development result in a breach of the EU Directive?

Yes, unmitigated, the development has potential to result in harm to individual dormice and result in impacts to the favourable conservation status of dormice locally via habitat loss and fragmentation.

Is the development unlikely to be licensed?

An EPS licence can only be granted if the development proposal is able to meet three tests:

- *the consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))*
- *there must be 'no satisfactory alternative' (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and*
- *the action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range' (Regulation 53(9)(b)).*

It is for you as the case officer to assess the proposals against the first two tests – you may wish to ask for further information from the applicant as if the proposals are unacceptable from a development control perspective they would not be granted an EPSM licence. In order to assess the development against the third test, sufficient details must be available to show how killing/injury/disturbance of dormice will be avoided and how any loss or damage to habitat will be avoided or, if not avoided, compensated. In this case I am of the opinion that there is now sufficient evidence to demonstrate that dormouse impacts have been adequately considered: there is a clear process for avoiding/minimising habitat impacts and for ongoing management and monitoring of the site and we can have confidence that the third test can be met.

Bats

Previous surveys have identified a number of bat species present in the immediate area, although the open nature of the site itself means that most bats were recorded utilising the boundary features. Trapping surveys in 2015 recorded a single female Bechstein's bat within Cherry Tree Row SINC immediately south of the site and this species is undoubtedly present regularly within woodlands in the immediate area and wider landscape. The SINC forms part of an extensive wooded landscape surrounding

Dunsbury Hill Farm within which are areas of prime Bechstein's habitat.

Whilst the proposals themselves will not result in any impacts to the mature trees that bat species will roost within, there are issues in relation to more nebulous impacts such as lighting and general construction and operational disturbance.

On the topic of lighting, the submitted lighting plan (ref. P173-442-R1 + BAMD) shows very intense lux levels immediately adjacent to and spilling onto the boundary woodland. This is particularly evident at the southern and south-eastern sides of the application site where levels between 6 and nearly 70 lux are shown at the vegetation line. Bat species, and especially sensitive woodland bats such as Bechstein's, are negatively impacted by levels as low as 1 lux and so further detail needs to be provided on how such light spillage can be minimised – do these contours take into account any mitigating features such as screening vegetation or hooding, for example? Impacts may occur both through column lighting and vehicle headlights (the turning circle is situated adjacent to woodland). Details such as luminaire hooding, fencing (solid would be best) and screening are required. In addition, it may be that lamp types (such as warm LED, with low/no UV component) can be used to further reduce impacts. Three dimensional light contouring would greatly assist in determining the extent of light spillage at canopy level. I consider that these details are required at this stage.

Given the 24-hour operation of this site I would expect noise to be an issue also. Vehicle noise (revving, idling, reversing, horns etc.) as well as generator noise (the plans show generators positioned immediately adjacent to Cherry Tree Row SINC) may require mitigating e.g. through acoustic fencing. There are no firm details of such fencing provided – the paladin-type fencing shown on the fencing plan LP2018-LA-WS-L-90-03 would not provide any screening for noise and light. In addition, there is a discrepancy over the stated fence height between the fencing plan and D&A Statement.

In the longer term the proposed woodland edge planting and bat boxes will provide enhancements to the habitat for bats and the measures provided as part of the wider Dunsbury scheme will offer more substantial bat mitigation.

Further comments on the additional information

The submitted Dormouse Statement provides, in my opinion, sufficient details to allow you to consider the proposals against the first two Habitat Regulations tests although it is you as the case officer who should consider these, and you should make explicit reference to the Regulations in your report. My previous comments stated that I considered the third test to be met.

(Officer Note - acoustic fencing is to be provided on the sensitive boundaries and there is a pre commencement condition - A18 of the hybrid application covers bat mitigation measures and the HCC Ecologist has confirmed that the lighting details can be covered by this, and therefore he has no objection)

Economic Development - Commercial and Housing

I have no concerns over the development having visited the site. It will also provide new employment opportunities during the build as well as occupation.

Engineering/Drainage The Lead Local Flood Authority should be consulted

The Lead Local Flood Authority No comments received

(Officer Note - The hybrid permission is the subject of a drainage condition that will

deal with this matter, also see EA comments)

Hampshire Highways- no comments to make

Environmental Health Manager, Community Group

Hampshire Wildlife Trust

Reiterate concerns raised by County Ecologist with regard to the illumination of the woodland edge and the potential impacts that may occur on bat species.

Development Engineer - The Highway Authority has no adverse comment to this application.

Southern Electric No adverse comments

Southern Gas Networks No adverse comments

Southern Water No comments received

Traffic Management Team No adverse comments

Planning Policy

The principal of development

The proposed development will greatly help in achieving the aim set out in the Core Strategy of boosting the borough's economic performance. It will also help to kick-start one of the borough council's key strategic sites. As such, under policies CS2, CS18 and strategic sites 3, the proposal is wholeheartedly supported. The scheme is also in line with the requirements of the original outline planning permission (APP/15/00732) as varied through APP/15/00732.

Efficient use of resources

As is set out in section 7 of the Design and Access Statement, the building is also required to meet an 'excellent' rating under the Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method as set out in condition B5(d) of permission APP/12/00338.

As part of the documentation which has been submitted with the current reserved matters application, a BREEAM pre-assessment estimator is included. To meet the Excellent level which is required, certain mandatory credits need to be achieved whilst the scheme as a whole needs to score 70 points. The pre-assessment shows that all of the mandatory credits have been achieved but only 62.05 points are targeted at this time.

It is of course perfectly possible that when considering the detailed design for a scheme, it is not feasible to fully meet sufficient points to get an excellent rating. It is absolutely correct for the pre-assessment to be submitted at this point, where detailed designs are being put together. To consider at the outline application stage would have been pre-mature. However it is pertinent to consider it at this point before detailed design parameters have been set.

On this basis, the pre-assessment estimator includes brief justifications for some of the credits which are not targeted in full. I agree with a large number of the credits which haven't been targeted and the stated reasons for not doing so. However there are a number of credits which haven't been targeted where more information is needed before a reasoned decision can be taken as to whether it would not be possible for a higher score to be achieved:

- MAN 01 – extensive consultation took place on the Dunsbury Hill original outline planning application, including a Development Consultation Forum

which includes consultation with a number of key stakeholders. For a scheme of this size, it would have been logical to consult all third parties anyway. Clarification is sought as to which of the criteria the scheme has not met and why this is the case.

- HEA 02 – it is not clear from the justification which has been provided what specifically about this project has meant that these two credits are not achievable.
- ENE 01 – it is not clear exactly how mechanical ventilation strategy effects the ability to gain more credits in this issue and why it is not cost effective in long term energy planning to provide a more effective building envelope or additional PV.
- ENE 04 – no justification is provided as to why these two credits are not achievable.
- TRA 01 and TRA 02 – as part of the outline planning permission, bus routes will be provided as well as a number of amenities. There are specific exceptions to these credits for phased developments and it is not clear if these have been considered.
- WAT 01 – it is not clear why further credits would not be economically viable for this scheme in the long term
- MAT 03 – it is not clear which materials will be sought with environmental ratings and which ones would not. It is also not clear why it would not be feasible to source more of the building materials from more environmentally sustainably sources.
- WST 05 – it is not specifically why this credit is not achievable. Clearly the fact that it is a new element of BREEAM 2014 does not in itself make it unachievable.
- LE 02, LE 03 and LE 04 – it is not clear why these credits are not achievable. Given that an ecologist is part of the design team already, it should be possible to confirm for certain whether these can be achieved.

Overall, there are a number of areas where the specifics of this site – particularly its greenfield location and the drainage requirements – limit what can realistically be achieved. However there are a number of credits which are not currently targeted and further information is required in order to confirm if a deviation from Condition B5(d) is justified.

Comments on further information

The scheme's BREEAM team have supplied further evidence which goes into detail regarding all of the points which I raised relating to BREEAM in my original comments. It is noteworthy that the statement confirms that this is a shell and core BREEAM assessment which is a consideration as this does limit the credits which are available. I do agree with the vast majority of the commentary which has been provided.

Ultimately the additionally targeted credits would increase the target score to 67.97, as is highlighted, this is extremely close to the Excellent threshold of 70 (to note – all mandatory credits for Excellent have been reached). As is highlighted, with the likely credits that could be achieved through the fit out, this would likely raise the score to 69.93%. As the statement sets out, this is on the cusp of Excellent and it would require only a single credit virtually anywhere in the assessment to push the scheme over the threshold. Happy with the justification that's been submitted

Landscape Team

Boundary treatments & site levels

- Block Plan (Dwg LP2018-LA-WS-L-90-03) indicates 2.4m height steel Paladin fencing, yet the D&A Statement identifies 2.7m height – please could height and colour finish be clarified?
- Extent of proposed 1.8m height mesh deer fencing (woodland matrix planting)

requires clear indication on a drawing in coordination with other boundary treatments. Will maintenance access gates be required?

- Site levels have evolved during the course of the application. The finalised extent of all retaining structures require clear indication on a drawing in coordination with the other boundary treatments.
- Proposed trees against the Paladin fencing – perhaps a security conflict and insufficient space?
- Paladin fencing around the staff amenity space and to both sides of the service yard pedestrian access seems excessive and contrary to the established Design Code. Furthermore, the Landscape Planting Strategy proposes 1.5-1.8m height double staggered hedge planting with a 1.5m height post and wire netting fence. Fencing proposals require rationalisation to simplify Paladin requirement and reduce prominence.
- Existing / proposed levels require clear indication to the top and bottom of slopes.
- The car park access proposes both barriers and vehicular gates – this seems excessive considering the Design Code, particularly when the pedestrian and cycle access points are not gated?

It may be appropriate to resolve the above comments by appropriate condition for submission of a fully annotated plan to finalise locations of proposed boundary treatments, access points and retaining structures that are coordinated with existing / proposed levels and include specification details to confirm height, design, materials, type and colour.

Landscape Planting Strategy

Anticipating subsequent submission of fully annotated planting plans to specify individually planted trees, matrix planting, shrubs, hedges and any areas of grass. I recommend the planting plan information shall include planting schedules, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers / densities and details of proposed planting implementation.

- Woodland matrix areas that narrow / taper below 1500mm should be specified as native hedge planting (with post and wire netting fence support).
- The very narrow green margin line between the pedestrian and cycle access route requires further clarification.
- Native hedge planting (with post and wire netting fence support) would be more appropriate than the hard paved margin currently indicated between parking bay row. A small number of paved access points can be retained to facilitate access.
- I support Jamie's comments regarding mitigation for loss of Oak associated with the wider development. Matrix planting mixes require addition of Oak, potentially to both mixes. Subject to agreement with Tristan and Jamie, I suggest 10% Oak transplants are included within the mixes, on the proviso that matrix areas are further overplanted with larger Oak and perhaps some Field Maple specimens for initial screen benefit (typically 14-16cm girth standards or feathered nursery stock).
- Native shrub planting species for the car park are appropriate.
- Tree planting species for the car park are appropriate.
- Use of Hawthorn for hedging is appropriate.

Hard Landscape Materials

No comments regarding the indicated selection. I anticipate annotated plans to identify hard surfacing material type, specification, edging, laying bond and colour will be submitted in due course.

Lighting Proposals

- Numerous light columns are placed in conflict with proposed trees. Careful coordination is required to ensure sufficient tree planting numbers and

- coverage remain consistent with the current Landscape Planting Strategy.
- Ensure columns are placed to avoid obstruction – there appears some current conflict with the cycle route, pedestrian routes and the substation access.

Comments on further information

The amended plans address the outstanding issue and are acceptable.

Hampshire County Council No Comments received

Arboriculturalist - Replacement planting should be heavily weighted to oaks

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 0

Number of site notices: Three

Statutory advertisement: 30/10/2015

Number of representations received: 0

Summary:

Comment:

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Landscape, Design and Visual Impact
- (iii) Economic Benefits
- (iv) Access & Traffic Management
- (v) Flood risk and Drainage
- (vi) Ecology
- (vii) Impact on Amenities
- (viii) Environmental Impacts
- (ix) Legal Agreement
- (x) Conditions

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The principle of developing the site for employment purposes has been established by the Local Plan (Dunsbury Hill Farm is allocated as a strategic employment site under policy CS18 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy) and the extant planning permission.

(ii) Landscape, Design and Visual Impact

Under the outline application it is proposed that the layout would be informed by the following Design Principles :-

1. Side roads with tree lined margins and hedges
2. Active frontages (doors and windows) facing roads and footpaths
3. Entrance facades which are readily identifiable
4. High quality pedestrian and cycle access across the site
5. Courtyard layouts forming outdoor spaces for people and parking
6. Shared space for walking, cycling and cars – denoted by design
7. Security - good natural surveillance with possible CCTV after hours
8. Accessible by all, including ramps, gradients for people with disabilities

- 7.3 Building heights would range between single storey and five stories with the tallest buildings located on the lowest areas. The plan also sets a limit on the overall height of buildings by relating them to contour heights. Bearing in mind that the highest part of Dunsbury Hill, just beyond the northern boundary of the site, is 50m AOD (above sea level), the plan states that the roofline for buildings should be kept below the 40m contour for phase 1 (western land) and below the 45m contour in phase 2 (eastern land). Thus the maximum heights would be respectively 10m and 5m below the maximum height of Dunsbury Hill.
- 7.4 The proposed development has regard to the Design Principles, however, owing to the occupier's requirements and the levels of the site, which require a large extent of cut and fill, the overall height would exceed the 40m contour set for phase 1, with an eaves height at 40.5m AOD, and an apex height of 42m AOD. The visual impact of this has been assessed as part of the submission including visual appraisals from key vantage points. The site is well screened by tree planting, and whilst a small element of the mass would sit above this tree line, however because of the curved and broken nature of the roof (3 bays) the visual impact is not considered of such magnitude as to be significantly detrimental to wider landscape views.
- 7.5 In respect to landscaping the site is visible from surrounding areas and an assessment was carried out under the extant APP/12/00338 submission of its existing landscape character to inform the Landscape Strategy which provides an over arching approach to the development of the site. The submitted details have been amended in response to the comments from the Landscape Architect and the Arboriculturalist and the proposed planting and tree protection measures are considered acceptable. The location for the proposed building is mainly grassland/field and the mature trees are sited to the edges of the site, and would be retained. There will be some loss of planting but this is low quality and the proposed replacement planting will compensate for its loss.

This revised landscape plan picks up the majority of the queries from the landscape architect and the changes which are summarised below are acceptable.

- Car park entrance gates and barriers revised to NW corner - both are needed to prevent unauthorised vehicular access (barriers insufficient on their own), however they have been moved closer together to rationalise appearance, with the gates now positioned behind the barrier.
- Native hedging added in between rows of parking spaces with access points punched through
- Narrow green strip between cycle and footpath widened and redefined as further native hedge planting

- Narrow strips of woodland matrix below 1500mm redefined and labelled as native hedge planting
- The question around the staff amenity area and removing the fence cannot be taken on board as this is necessary for Secure by Design purposes. The fence around this area will however have native hedge planting of the same height directly behind it.
- Proposed trees against the paladin fencing - confirmation that the matrix planting will have shrubs placed along the boundary with the site fencing to ensure site security is not compromised as the trees grow.
- 9 x additional visitor cycle hoops provided next to covered cycle storage
- Confirmation of perimeter fence types and heights (3m acoustic fencing on eastern and southern boundaries), 2.7m anthracite grey PPC finish elsewhere, 1.8m around staff amenity area to reflect hedging behind, deer fencing also plotted
- Updated to show additional oaks within matrix planting to south and front of the site (19 new oaks in total)

(iii) Economic Benefits

- 7.6 The proposed development will greatly help in achieving the aims set out in the Core Strategy of boosting the borough's economic performance. It will also help to kick-start one of the borough council's key strategic sites. As such, under policies CS2, CS18 and strategic sites 3, the proposal is supported by Planning Policy and Economic Development. The scheme is also in line with the requirements of the original outline planning permission (APP/15/00732) as varied through APP/15/00732.

(iv) Access & Traffic Management

- 7.7 The proposal provides 140 car parking spaces for 18,000 sq m of floorspace. The current adopted parking standards for non-residential development within Havant Borough Council require for B8 development 1 space per 90 square metres, which for the development proposed equates to a maximum of 200 spaces. However, this is a maximum standard, and whilst the draft parking documentation now refers to minimum standards, this document has yet to be adopted and has limited weight. In respect to the NPPF Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states:

'If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:

- *the accessibility of the development;*
- *the type, mix and use of development;*
- *the availability of and opportunities for public transport;*
- *local car ownership levels; and*
- *an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles'*

- 7.8 DHF lies directly adjacent to the strategic road network (A3M) with a new access link road connecting the site to Hulbert Road, and is in between the large residential areas of Waterlooville (west of the A3) and Leigh Park (east of the site). Bedhampton Railway Station is located within 2km and Havant is about 2.5km, additionally there is a bus stop approx 400m away, and as the DHF site develops it is envisaged that a bus service will run through the site with a stop directly outside the application site. In addition the outline scheme provided for foot path and cycle links along the access road.

- 7.9 The B8 distribution centre will run on a 24/7 basis, with shift patterns meaning a consistent turnover of staff during the working day. It is predicted that the initial development (Phase 1) will employ approximately **140** staff across **three** shifts within the warehouse environment, together with approximately **25** staff within the office and support areas. Given the split between warehouse and office and 24/7 nature of the business, not all of these staff will ever be present on site at one time. The time at the changeover of the busiest two shifts would see approximately 135 staff on site, some arriving and some leaving.
- 7.10 Under Schedule 3 of the Section 106 agreement attached to the overarching Dunsbury Hill Farm planning permission each individual plot is required to prepare a site specific travel plan, to be agreed with Hampshire County Council as highway authority in advance of occupation. The Section 106 agreement contained a comprehensive Travel Plan Framework that sets out four key objectives:
'Objective 1: to maximise opportunities for staff and visitors to travel to the business park and hotel development by means other than single occupancy car;
Objective 2: to encourage new staff to commute to work by modes of travel other than the single occupant car;
Objective 3: to reduce the carbon footprint of the development by minimising transport contributions;
Objective 4: improve access to the site for all.'
- 7.11 It is therefore considered that given the accessibility of the site and the objectives of the Travel Plan, the proposed 140 spaces provided which represent 70% of the maximum standard is acceptable.

(v) Flood risk and Drainage

The site is covered by the flood risk assessment submitted with the hybrid application which advised that the site is not at risk from flooding and will not subject other properties to flooding provided that greenfield run off rates are adhered to. In accordance with this storm water run-off will be restricted to green field run off rates with the remainder of the water generated by rainfall onto hard surfaces to be attenuated on site until the storm has receded. The attenuation would be achieved by a proportion of on plot attenuation (the plot 2 drainage proposal offers a porous car park SUDS drainage technique) and the remainder of the plot storm water drainage would discharge to underground tanks which have a restricted outfall to the Hermitage Stream. This is a temporary measure until the centralised balancing pond serving the DHF site as a whole has been constructed.

(vi) Ecology

- 7.12 The application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment, which provides a robust assessment of the potential ecological impacts of this proposal. The application is supported by detailed ecological survey works stemming both from the previous assessment for the main hybrid application as well as bespoke updating surveys for Plot 2. The ecological surveys have identified a number of receptors which are at risk of impact from these proposals. Of these, two (bats and hazel dormouse) are European protected species.
- 7.13 The presence of hazel dormice within the habitat surrounding the plot has been confirmed in 2015 and it must be assumed that this species could occur in any dense woody vegetation, including bramble, in the vicinity. The proposals will result in the loss of c.1000m² of potential habitat (some of this 'temporary') and so impacts to

dormice can be assumed. These works will be carried out under a European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence from Natural England, with vegetation cut back in a staged process between winter and early summer.

Bats

There is potential for disturbance especially from vehicles using the loading/service area arising from noise and lighting. The plans have been amended to provide acoustic fencing to mitigate the impacts of traffic noise. In respect to lighting this impact will need to form part of the mitigation measures in respect to Condition A18. The County Ecologist has confirmed his acceptance of this approach.

Reptiles

All four common native species have been recorded on site and a translocation process has been underway since September. The county Ecologist is satisfied with the measures in place for reptile species.

Hazel dormouse

This development is highly likely to affect dormice, which receive strict legal protection under UK and EU law. Where developments affect European Protected Species (EPS), permission can be granted unless the development is likely to result in a breach of the EU Directive underpinning the Habitats Regulations.

The development has potential to result in harm to individual dormice and result in impacts to the favourable conservation status of dormice locally via habitat loss and fragmentation.

An EPS licence can only be granted if the development proposal is able to meet three tests

- *the consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))*
- *there must be 'no satisfactory alternative' (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and*
- *the action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range' (Regulation 53(9)(b)).*

The ecologist has advised that there is now sufficient evidence to demonstrate that dormouse impacts have been adequately considered: there is a clear process for avoiding/minimising habitat impacts and for ongoing management and monitoring of the site and there is confidence that the third test can be met, and the submitted Dormouse Statement provides, in his opinion, sufficient details to allow the Council to consider the proposals against the first two Habitat Regulations tests

7.14 *In respect to the first test*

Dunsbury Hill Farm (DHF) is one of the few sites in South Hampshire capable of delivering large scale employment floorspace across a range of commercial, manufacturing and logistics business types. As far back as 2008, a logistics study was carried out for PUSH that identified an outstanding requirement for over 70,000m² of distribution space largely from major employers locally wishing to expand and remain in the area. The report stated that DHF was a prime location for such floorspace as with the exception of DHF, the market in South Hampshire was and continues to be constrained by a shortage of available sites and development opportunities. At a local level the Havant Core Strategy, adopted in March 2011,

identifies DHF in Policy CS18 as a key strategic site that could provide approximately a third of all new employment floorspace required within Havant during the plan period to 2026. The development of the DHF site is crucial on a social and economic level to the local area providing major local employers who need to move/expand the opportunity to do so and retain the associated jobs and supply chain benefits within the region.

7.15 *In respect to the second test*

The proposed development is for a specific occupier with the building and site layout reflecting the needs of the proposed occupier. There is a necessity to provide vehicular access for fire trucks around the entire perimeter of the building. Additionally there is approximately a 7 metre drop from the access road to the southern edge of Plot 2. In order to achieve an appropriate gradient into the service yard, the site must therefore be levelled. This also means the building has to be set back within the plot with the car park area at the front to provide an acceptable slope down to the fully accessible loading bay area. The necessity to maintain the emergency access route at the rear means the building cannot sit at the very back of the site. A decrease in the proposed floorspace would make the scheme unviable and as the DHF site is subject to height restrictions a reduction in the footprint would necessitate an increase in height which would not be acceptable because of the adverse visual impact from key viewpoints. Therefore there is no satisfactory alternative.

- 7.16 The hedge would be replanted with a more appropriate mix of native species that will provide improved feeding habitat for dormice, alongside other enhancements and buffer planting. It is considered that the proposed scheme meets all three tests in order to obtain the required EPS licence for the temporary loss of habitat.

(vii) Impact on Amenities

- 7.17 An important consideration is the potential impacts on the amenities of the area, including residents living close to the site or along approach roads to it. Changes in the appearance of the site, traffic, increased activity and risk of noise, lighting, air quality, access and leisure opportunities are relevant considerations, as summarised in Local Plan policy CS16. These impacts were considered under the hybrid application and found to be acceptable, and visual and highways impacts are further considered above. In respect to the other considerations which may differ, these relate to environmental impacts which are covered in section 7(viii) below.

(viii) Environmental Impacts and BREEAM

- 7.18 The application is supported by a Noise Impact Assessment, which identifies that the nearest noise sensitive receptors are located 230m to the east and southeast and on the opposite side of the A3(M). The submission has been assessed by the Environmental Health Officer who, subject to the provision of acoustic fencing does not raise objection. In terms of the impact on the proposed hotel, the service yard would be located away from this boundary, beyond the proposed warehouse building and this relationship is considered acceptable.
- 7.19 In respect to BREEAM the outline application anticipates that the development would achieve an excellent rating. The scheme's BREEAM team have supplied further evidence which goes into detail regarding all of the points raised by Planning Policy relating to BREEAM. It is noteworthy that the statement confirms that this is a shell and core BREEAM assessment which is a consideration as this does limit the credits which are available. The vast majority of the commentary which has been provided has been accepted.

- 7.20 Ultimately the additionally targeted credits would increase the target score to 67.97, as is highlighted, this is extremely close to the Excellent threshold of 70 and all mandatory credits for Excellent have been reached. As is highlighted, with the likely credits that could be achieved through the fit out, this would likely raise the score to 69.93%. As the statement sets out, this is on the cusp of Excellent and it would require only a single credit virtually anywhere in the assessment to push the scheme over the threshold it is therefore considered that this aspect of the proposal is acceptable.

(ix) Legal Agreement

- 7.21 The development of the site remains subject to the requirements of the Section 106 agreement on the outline application and the obligations are summarised below:-
- 1 ASDA Roundabout – Provision of land & financial contribution.
 - 2 Bus link Hulbert Road to Woolston Road
 - 3 Travel Plan
 - 4 Public access to new roads within the development
 - 5 Public access to open space within the development
 - 6 Footpath to connect Hermitage Stream Bridge to Park Lane via western part of site.
 - 7 Cycle/Footpath along Hermitage Stream – rights to construct, maintain, transfer and public access
 - 8 Cycle/Footpath south of Hermitage Stream to Purbrook Way– rights to construct, maintain, transfer and public access
 - 9 Cycle/Footpath west of site to A3M junction – provide (timing to be identified)
 - 10 Employment & Skills Plan
 - 11 Drainage - SUDS maintenance & bond (only if satisfactory other legal provisions available)
 - 12 S106 monitoring fee

(x) Conditions

- 7.22 The hybrid application is subject to a number of outstanding conditions and further submission of information in respect to the DHF site as a whole is required to discharge these conditions which comprise:-

- Condition A5 – Samples of external materials and surfacing;
- Condition A10 – Tree Protection Plan;
- Condition A11 – Environmental management during Construction
- Condition A12 – Contractor parking on site
- Condition A13 – Site Compound & Storage
- Condition A14 – Contaminated Land – scheme
- Condition A16 – Archaeology
- Condition A17 – Ecology: Dormice
- Condition A18 – Ecology: Bats
- Condition B4 – Other Strategic documents (Design Code & Public Realm Strategy)
- Condition B10 – Drainage Plans and Information.

8 Conclusion

The submitted details are considered acceptable and approval is recommended.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to **GRANT APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS** for application APP/15/01156 subject to the following conditions

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-10001-P5 Location Plan
DHF-BMD-Z2-GF-DR-A-11000-P7 Ground floor plan Cat A
DHF-BMD-Z2-GF-DR-A-11001-P12 Ground floor GA plan Cat B
DHF-BMD-Z2-GF-DR-A-11009-P9 Ground floor GA plan Phase 2
DHF-BMD-Z2-01-DR-A-11003-P6 First floor plan Cat A
DHF-BMD-Z2-01-DR-A-11003-P7 First floor GA plan Cat B
DHF-BMD-Z2-01-DR-A-11010-P6 First floor GA plan Phase 2
DHF-BMD-Z2-02-DR-A-11004-P3 Second floor plan Cat A
DHF-BMD-Z2-02-DR-A-11005-P6 Second floor GA plan Cat B
DHF-BMD-Z2-02-DR-A-11011-P5 Second floor GA plan Phase 2
DHF-BMD-Z2-03-DR-A-11006-P6 Third floor GA plan Cat B
DHF-BMD-Z2-03-DR-A-11012-P7 Third floor GA plan Phase 2
DHF-BMD-Z2-RF-DR-A-11007-P8 Roof plan Cat A
DHF-BMD-Z2-RF-DR-A-11008-P5 Roof plan Cat B
DHF-BMD-Z2-RF-DR-A-11013-P9 Roof GA plan Phase 2
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-12000-P5 Proposed Elevations Portsmouth CC Cat A
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-12001-P9 Proposed Elevations Cat B
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-12002-P6 Proposed Elevations Phase 2 sheet 1
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-12003-P8 Proposed Elevations Phase 2 sheet 2
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-12006-P3 Proposed gatehouse
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-13000-P2 Proposed Sections Cat A
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-13001-P3 Proposed Sections Cat B
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-13002-P2 Proposed Sections Phase 2
DHF-BMD-Z2-XX-DR-A-13004-P5 Proposed Site Sections
LA-WS-L-90-03 Rev B Landscape planting strategy
LP2018-LA-WS-L-90-02 RevN (c) Landscape Proposals
LP2018-LA-WS-L-90-03 Rev D Block Plan (Fencing Plan)
LP2018-LA-WS-L-90-05 External finishes
P173-442-R2-1 Exterior lighting design Rev 2 - DRAFT
P173-442-R2-2 Exterior lighting design Rev 2 vertical spill calculation - DRAFT
Fat Face DHF Company Profile
Dunsbury Hill Farm Design Code
Dunsbury Hill Farm Plot 2 Design & Access Statement
4487 Plot 2 below ground drainage strategy mark up
35226 001 Dunsbury Hill Farm Noise Assessment
ES Chapter 14 Plot 2 revision
ES Chapter 14 Plot 2 revision Appendix 1
ES Chapter 14 Plot 2 revision Appendix 2
Plot 2 Ecological Impact Assessment Nov 15
Dormouse Statement
Noise assessment addendum
Updated assessment dated 15 December 2015
Email dated 21/12/15 from James Brewer confirming vehicle loading/unloading

arrangements

Jakoustic Acoustic Fencing and Barriers document

Parking statement

BREEAM statement

BREEAM statement Appendix 1 worked examples

BREEAM statement Appendix 2 Pre-assessment summary

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.