

In terms of the impact on residential amenity, detailed consideration has been given to the potential relationship of the development on existing residential properties as set out in part 7 of this report. This has resulted in the recommendation for a number of conditions to ensure that residential amenities are protected and an acceptable relationship is achieved.

Highway matters have been considered in detail with Hampshire County Council (the Highways Authority). In this regard barriers are proposed to ensure that access to the site is restricted from Langstone Road during the morning peak period. Improvements to footpath networks and Travel Plan requirements would be secured by S106 legal agreement requirements. Parking has also been assessed and is considered acceptable in principle; however, the Reserved Matters applications would need to ensure adequate parking for each phase of the development.

Flood risk has been considered at this outline stage and statutory consultees have raised no objection to the proposals subject to the imposition of planning conditions and these are recommended.

It is noted that the proposals would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset and this is assessed in part 7 of the report. Overall, it is considered that the loss is outweighed by the benefits secured by the re-development.

The scheme has been assessed in terms of its potential impact on the SPA designations and protected species and a Habitats Regulations Assessment / Appropriate Assessment has been carried out in consultation with Natural England. The proposal has also been subject to consultation with the Council's Ecologist and impacts can be avoided and suitably mitigated by the imposition of appropriate recommended conditions.

Finally other environmental impacts have been assessed such as contamination and air quality. Subject to recommended conditions these impacts can be suitably addressed.

Following a detailed assessment of the proposed development and as set out in part 9 planning permission can be recommended.

1 Site Description

- 1.1 Langstone Technology Park is located to the south of the A27 dual carriageway, to the west of the A3023 Langstone Road and to the East of Brookside Road and the Southmoor Lane Industrial Estate.
- 1.2 The site is accessed from Langstone Road to the east and Brookside Road to the west. Both accesses are joined by interior service roads. The eastern access road also serves the Premier Inn hotel and the Langbrook Farm public house/restaurant.
- 1.3 The site has a 'campus' appearance originally forming an IBM business park with extensive buildings developed in the 1970's with substantial footprints and a horizontal emphasis with a conformity of materials. The buildings are surrounded by extensive car parking and landscaping. The site is now occupied by a range of individual companies including high tech uses.

1.4 In general terms the park is divided into three areas:

- The northern section which incorporates Building 1000 and parking (part of Building 1000 has recently been demolished)
- The central section, which contains office buildings, a data centre and acts as an amenity core for the park (including a nursery), and
- The southern section, which is predominantly parking, with re-development of industrial units currently taking place to the south-west part.

1.5 In relation to the sites surroundings, the park is located in a mainly commercial area as set out below:

South:

To the south is a commercial business development off Penner Road including Luxor Park and Pyramid Park. These are large business units of modern design and a variety of sizes with parking servicing the developments. Further south of this commercial development is open land leading to Langstone Harbour.

West:

To the west are a variety of commercial business premises fronting Southmoor Lane and Brookside Road. There are also a small number of residential properties in Brookside Road. Further West is Budds Farm sewerage works.

North:

To the north of the site runs footpath 50 with the A27 west bound slipway from the Langstone roundabout and the A27 dual carriageway beyond. Footpath 51 runs north from the northeast corner of the site towards Havant Town Centre, Solent Road and Havant bus and train stations.

East:

To the east of the site is footpath 51 and the Langbrook River, there are also trees to the south-east part of the site boundary. Beyond these features are a Premier Inn and the Langbrook Public House/Restaurant to the north-east of the application site. To the southern part of the eastern side of the site are residential properties in Brookmead Way and Langbrook Close.

2 Planning History

2.1 The application site has been subject to numerous planning and advertisement consent applications, the more significant/relevant applications are listed below:

92/50238/022 - Single storey extension to Building 24, undercroft area enlarged fire exit lobby/link from Building 26, new facade to night security entrance, PERMITTED, 07/09/1992

92/50238/024 - Variation of condition 2 of P.P.18838/82 for 2,000000sq.f of industrial/office floor space to extend time period for submission of reserved matters from 6 to 8 years. PERMITTED, 15/10/1992

93/50238/031 - Construction of new building for class B1 (business) use together with parking and service areas, access roads and landscaping (site area 3.32 hectares), PERMITTED, 05/08/1994

94/50238/038 - Infill of building 25 undercroft area to provide additional floorspace, PERMITTED, 18/01/1995

94/50238/041 - Extension of existing car park (South) to provide approx. 250 replacement spaces, PERMITTED, 16/02/1995

95/50238/044 - Extension of existing car park to provide approximately 216 new spaces., PERMITTED, 11/05/1995

95/50238/049 - Extension of existing car park (south) to provide 77 new spaces., PERMITTED, 05/09/1996

96/50238/061 - Creation of new ditch and culverts for the purposes of diverting the existing water courses, including the construction of a new footbridge along the line of the existing footpath (No.49), PERMITTED, 06/11/1997

00/50238/068 - 1) Demolition of buildings (21 and part 24) on A27 frontage and redevelopment with DIY Retail Store (11,288 sq.m), Garden Centre (2,787 sq.m) External Trade Area (1,858 sq.m) and car parking (640 spaces), with vehicular access to Langstone Road (A3023) and Brookside Road (incorporating revised junction layout arrangements), new cycleway and landscaping. 2) Erection of 2 No. B1 Production Units (9, 290 sq.m) in south west corner with service access road, 310 parking spaces and landscaping.3) Demolition of building (16) and revised parking layout for remainder of site including landscaping. 4) Demolition of 4 dwellings (39a, 39b, 43 and 47 Brookside Road) (Re-Consultation), REFUSED, 16/07/2001

02/50238/076 - Demolition of four dwelling houses. New access road layout, including formation of new roundabout with Brookside Road and construction of car park adjacent to northern boundary with A27. PERMITTED, 21/01/2003

APP/10/00272 - Demolition of existing steel clad building and two portacabins to make way for a single storey timber framed building to house a 52 place nursery school., PERMITTED, 10/09/2010

APP/11/01298 - Installation of 4No. roof mounted cooling units and chiller plant; extension at ground floor (level 1) to provide room for 2No. stand-by generators with attenuating exhaust baffles and louvred roof top air intake housing., PERMITTED, 04/10/2011

APP/14/00631 - Variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission APP/11/01297 (which varied condition 3 of original Planning Permission APP/10/00272) to remove restriction on catchment area., PERMITTED, 17/10/2014

APP/15/00484 - Change of use from store to gym facility., PERMITTED, 09/07/2015

APP/15/01225 - Installation of 2No. roof mounted condenser units and associated chiller pipe work to support 2No. additional internal computer room air conditioning units., PERMITTED, 11/12/2015

APP/19/00297 - Proposed alteration to the existing east facing elevation to accommodate a new entrance threshold and associated external works., PERMITTED, 13/06/2019

GEN/19/00354 - EIA Screening Opinion - Erection of new industrial units and rationalisation of south car park, demolition of part of the northernmost building with

new elevation on the remaining part of the building, new screen on adjacent building and extension to existing car park.- Not EIA development 29/05/19

GEN/19/00370 - Development Consultation Forum (DCF) proposal for (1) outline permission for part demolition and reconfiguration of Building 1000 and reconfiguration of car park layout and (2) detailed permission for new employment (B1c, B2 and B8) units.

Officer Comment: *Development Consultation Forum held 21st May 2019*

GEN/19/00681 - Notification of application for listed building status, 19/08/2019

Officer Comment: *This request in relation to Building 6000 was considered by English Heritage who confirmed on the 3rd February 2020 the following:*

We have taken into account all the representations made and completed our assessment of the building. Having considered our recommendation, the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport has decided not to add the former IBM Building 6000, Langstone Technology Park, Havant to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. Building 6000 is not therefore a Listed Building.

APP/19/00703 - Part-demolition of Building 1000 and associated works; the erection of new flexible use industrial units; and a new parking layout with associated works to layout and access and felling of two trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (Norway Maples). (22.07.20). Request to discharge conditions 3,4,5 & 6 (02.11.20). PERMITTED 22/07/20

APP/19/00806 - Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission APP/19/00296 (Erection of a new building entrance structure, reception/lobby refurbishment and associated hard and soft landscaping works) to amend approved plans., PERMITTED, 09/10/2019

APP/21/00134 - Application for non material change to Planning Permission APP/19/00703 relating to change to approved plans and amendment to proposed elevations., REFUSED, 18/03/2021

APP/21/00405 - Variation of Conditions 2, 3, 8, 18, 19, 22 and 25 of Planning Permission APP/19/00703 relating to the erection of the flexible use industrial units in the south-western corner of the site (Phase 1). (25.08.21). Request to discharge conditions 4,7,9,10,11,12,13,14 & 15 (06.09.21). Request to discharge conditions 5 & 6 (24.12.21)., PERMITTED, 25/08/2021

APP/21/00517 - Display of 4No. non-illuminated totem signs; 2No. non-illuminated marketing board signs; 1No. illuminated wall mounted sign. – PERMITTED, 13/08/2021

APP/21/00926 - Application for non-material change to Planning Permission APP/21/00405 relating to amendments to Condition 2 plans approved (changes to elevational treatment of Buildings 1000 and 4000) – PERMITTED, 01/10/2021

GEN/22/00093 - Screening Opinion - Proposed Redevelopment of land at Langstone Technology Park, Havant. The proposals include phased demolition of existing buildings (predominantly office but including labs, industrial, data centre and ancillary uses) and construction of up to 52,000 sqm Gross External Area (GEA) flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g) (i)- (iii) / B2 / B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)); and associated works (all matters reserved except access).– Opinion Issued 1st April 2022 Development not EIA development

Officer Comment: *This relates to the current development proposals.*

APP/22/00360 - Display of 1No. wall mounted fascia sign. PERMITTED, 10/06/22

APP/22/00615 – Application for non-material change to planning permission
APP/21/00405 relating to amendment of parking provision. PERMITTED, 24/10/22

2.2 Applications for commercial development to the east of the site:

APP/12/00467 - Erection of budget hotel and family restaurant, new access from Langstone Technology Park service road, and associated parking and landscaping. PERMITTED, 14/06/2013

APP/14/01300 – Erection of four storey hotel (including restaurant for hotel guests only) with associated car parking and landscaping; and air conditioning units in compounds, with access from the private access road to Langstone Technology Park., PERMITTED, 26/05/2015

APP/15/01266 – Erection of four storey hotel (including restaurant for hotel guests only) with associated car parking and landscaping; and air conditioning units in compounds, with access from the private access road to Langstone Technology Park. Request to Discharge Condition 19 of Planning Permission APP/14/01300 (04.11.15)., PERMITTED, 20/01/2016

2.3 In addition to the above planning history the following S52 Agreement has been considered in relation to this development:

A S52 Agreement dated the 9th November 1982 included the following provisions:

1. The measures referred to in clause 2 above shall be such as to ensure that between the hours of 7.15am and 9am not more than 250 employees vehicles per hour enter the access to the IBM Havant Plant from the southbound carriageway of Langstone Road and shall include without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing the issuing at any one time to not more than 500 employees of distinguishing stickers indicating that such employees are permitted to enter the access to the IBM plant from the southbound carriageway of Langstone Road.

2. Only employees whose motor vehicles bear in a conspicuous position (which shall in the case of a four wheeled vehicle be the windscreen) the sticker referred to above shall be permitted to enter the IBM Havant Plant from the south bound carriageway of Langstone Road in a vehicle between the hours of 7.15 am and 9am and IBM shall maintain at its own expense such regulatory personnel as may be necessary to enforce this requirement.

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for Outline Planning Application for Phased demolition of existing buildings and the erection of new flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g)(i)-(iii)/B2/B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)); and associated works. With all matters reserved except Access.

3.2 With regards to the use classes referred to:

- E(g)(i) – (iii) – relates to (i) an office to carry out any operational or administrative functions, (ii) the research and development of products or processes, or (iii) any industrial process, being a use, which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit
- B2 - Use for the carrying on of an industrial process other than one falling within the uses described in Class E
- B8 - Use for storage or as a distribution centre

The ancillary Use Classes referred to comprise:

- E(b) - for the sale of food and drink principally to visiting members of the public where consumption of that food and drink is mostly undertaken on the premises
- E(d) - for indoor sport, recreation or fitness, not involving motorised vehicles or firearms, principally to visiting members of the public
- E(f) - for a crèche, day nursery or day centre, not including a residential use, principally to visiting members of the public,

3.3 As stated above the application is in outline with all matters except for access to be subject to the Reserved Matters application stage. Nevertheless, to demonstrate how the development could be provided on site the following plans have been provided with the application:

Indicative Master Plan,
Parameter Plans (including Access, Development Plots, Building Height and indicative phasing),
Landscape Framework Strategy,
Landscape General Arrangement,
Indicative Site Sections

In addition, the following documents and information have also been submitted setting out the potential impacts and opportunities resulting from the proposed development and how they are proposed to be addressed:

Planning Statement
Design and Access Statement and Principles Document
Masterplan Noise Assessment
Air Quality Assessment
Land Quality Assessment (including Geo-Environmental findings, Hydrogeology and Groundwater Vulnerability, Hydrology, Flood Risk and Flood Mapping, Site Sensitivity and Soil Chemistry)
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
Bio-diversity Net Gain Assessment
Utilities Statement & Strategy
Existing Conditions Summary Report (including Existing Buildings Assessment)
Odour Technical Note
Heritage Statement
Statement of Community Involvement
Transport Assessment

Framework Travel Plan
Sustainability and Energy Statement
Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy Report
Economic Benefits Statement

3.4 These matters will be explored in detail in part 7 of this report.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS11	(Protecting and Enhancing the Special Environment and Heritage of Havant Borough)
CS14	(Efficient Use of Resources)
CS15	(Flood and Coastal Erosion)
CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19	(Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
CS2	(Employment)
CS20	(Transport and Access Strategy)
CS21	(Developer Requirements)
CS8	(Community Safety)
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

DM17	(Contaminated Land)
DM20	(Historic Assets)
AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM18	(Protecting New Development from Pollution)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020
N/A

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

The following Section sets out the consultees' most up to date responses to the application following amendments secured during the life of the application. Please note that the consultees' earlier comments are generally included in Appendix L for reference purposes.

Councillor Imogen Payter – St Faiths

No comments received

Councillor J Branson – St Faiths

No comments received

Councillor T Pike – St Faiths

No formal comments received. Cllr Pike has discussed the application with the case officer.

Arboriculturalist

No comments received.

Building Control, Havant Borough Council

Public sewers located on the site, Southern Water should be consulted regarding any proposals.

Coastal Engineering

Final Comments:

I can confirm that we have no further comment to make, following on from our response sent on 6th June 2022.

Further Comments:

Thank you for re-consulting with Coastal Partners on the above application, I can confirm that following the submission of a revised FRA, we are happy to remove our previous objection to the proposed development.

The revised Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) advises that the existing ground levels of the site vary from 4.5mAOD to 5mAOD, whilst finished floor levels (FFLs) for all buildings within the development are proposed to be set at a minimum of 4.55mAOD, above the 1:200 year extreme tidal flood level for Langstone Harbour in 2115.

Coastal Partners would still encourage the applicant to further explore the incorporation of flood resistance and resilience measures, where practical to do so. Given the scale of the proposed development, it is also recommended that the applicant prepare a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan, in accordance with advice from the Environment Agency, the local emergency services and Havant Borough Council emergency planners.

Community Infrastructure

Comments

Should a S106 agreement become necessary for this site, arising out of consultee responses, appropriate HBC S106 monitoring fees will need to be included for more information see: <https://www.havant.gov.uk/monitoring-fees>.

From 1/4/22, they are:

£798.00 per non-financial head of term (outside the scope of VAT)

5% of cost per financial head of term (outside the scope of VAT)

Conservation Officer

The Site

Langstone Technology Park consists of four main buildings of modular construction with minimalist landscaping linking around the buildings.

The site is a 'campus style' industrial park with buildings dating from the early 1970s. Originally built for IBM it housed one of two manufacturing plants in the UK. The smallest building was the first to be built on the site and appears in the In-house Arup Journal April 1971 the caption refers to the building being completed in 1970.

The buildings were designed and built by Arup with landscaping for the courtyard and grounds by James Russell. Design 39 Journal – VADS reports that 'the Financial Times award for industrial architecture 1972' was won by 'the new plant at Havant, Hampshire, designed by Arup Associates'.

In terms of social history, the sites links with the development of the computing technology is of significance.

Building 6000 was put forward for statutory listing in 2019 however, it did not meet the requirements and was subsequently turned down for listing. However, the current buildings because of their design/construction provenance and social history significance are considered collectively as non-designated heritage assets. Whilst the existing buildings are quite plain by today's standards, they do represent an era of design and have by their association to Arup a certain level of standing in terms of design.

Legislative and Policy Context

When assessing the proposal, the following legislation and policy context is taken in consideration.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. The 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2', states at paragraph 4:

'The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic, and artistic interest' and provides at paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 that in order for the Local Planning Authority to make decisions in line with legal requirements, the objectives of the development plan; and, the policy requirements of the NPPF, great importance is placed on understanding the nature, extent and level of the significance of the heritage asset.

The revised NPPF sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in the following paragraphs:

'189. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

194. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

195. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

196. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

197. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Considering potential impacts

199. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

201. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply: a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses

of the site; and b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

202. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

203. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Local Policy

With regards to local planning policy, the following are relevant:

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development that:

Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non-statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic assets of Havant.

Proposal:

The proposal is for an outline application to demolish the existing buildings on the site and erection of new buildings to accommodate flexible employment floorspace. This would include the demolition of the buildings which have been identified as non-designated heritage assets in the 2021 preapplication response.

Assessment:

The application is accompanied by an updated Heritage Statement (February 2022) by EDP. This includes an assessment of the historical significance of the site and its buildings. The report concludes the following key points:

“The buildings of the Langstone Technology Park occupy the former IBM manufacturing complex established in the late 1960s. The assessment has demonstrated that the factory was built for IBM as the second manufacturing plant in the UK and as part of a larger global expansion of all IBM facilities.

“In terms of its architectural interest, the factory was built at a time of great change within the approach to the design and function of factories, and yet it is not in itself at the cutting edge of either the technology of construction, design of plan form or implementation of forward thinking, especially when compared to other comparable factories of the period. This is clearly recognised in its rejection for statutory listing by Historic England and the buildings within the complex carry no statutory protection as a consequence.

“It is recognised that, collectively, the complex as a whole has a modicum of architectural interest in the broadest terms at local level, insofar as they are representative of an expanding technological industry in the latter part of the 20th century within the area. This little interest is not represented in the whole of the complex however, and it is apparent that few areas remain unaltered”.

Whilst the heritage statement recognises that buildings have collective, local historic interest, it does not conclude that the loss of the non-designated heritage assets would result in any harm. Para 203 of the NPPF (July 2021) states that:

“The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.

As the proposal would result in the total loss of the buildings, it is considered that **‘substantial harm’** will result. As such, the proposal cannot be supported on heritage grounds. The wider benefits of the proposal would therefore have to be weighed up against this level of harm going forward in an application.

If it deemed necessary to approve the application, it is advised that a condition is included which requires a historic building record to be carried out prior to the demolition of the buildings (suggested wording provided below):

1. Prior to the demolition of the building known as ‘Building 6000’, a historic building record (including a full photographic record of the exterior and interior of the building), shall be submitted to, approved and will be retained by the Local Planning Authority. Original photographs suitably referenced, dated and supplemented by a key plan will be needed in fulfilment of this condition.

Reason - To serve as a record of the building in its existing state. It is considered necessary for this to be a pre-commencement condition as these details need to be agreed prior to the demolition of the building and thus go to the heart of the planning permission.

Conclusion

As the proposal would result in the total loss of the Building 6000, which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, it is considered that 'substantial harm' will result. As such, the proposal cannot be supported on heritage grounds. As advised in paragraph 203 of the NPPF, the wider benefits of the proposal would therefore have to be weighed up against this level of harm going forward in an application.

Countryside Access Team

No comments received.

County Archaeologist

Although the landscape would have some inherent archaeological potential, in view of the substantial and extensive development on site it is likely that the archaeological potential has been lost or severely compromised. In view of this I would not raise any archaeological issues.

Ecologist

Further Comments

The application now includes a Habitats Regulations Assessment (Phlorum, March 2022). The HRA concludes that the proposal is unlikely to result in a Likely Significant Effect on the Solent National Sites Network. I concur with this conclusion.

Original Comments

The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Phlorum, February 2022) and a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Phlorum, February 2022). The site comprises an extensive complex of modern commercial buildings, areas of hard surfacing and managed amenity grassland with various areas of planted ornamental vegetation. A small watercourse is situated at the eastern boundary and a small area of woodland located within the south-east corner of the site. I am content that overall the site is of limited ecological value and any ecological features are of value at the site level. There are habitats of greater importance situated to the south, with several areas of open grassland included within the Solent Waders & Brent Goose Strategy (SWBGS) and providing terrestrial supporting habitat linked to the nearby Chichester & Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA). In terms of protected and notable species, HBIC holds records of Water Voles from the watercourse at the eastern boundary and there are also records of several bat species flying within/across the site.

The proposals will entail the demolition of many of the buildings within the site as well as the removal of areas of existing vegetation. Overall, I am content that these habitats are not likely to support populations of protected and notable species, and that further detailed ecological surveys are not required at this site. Ecological mitigation is best pursued through the avoidance of potential impacts. The highest value habitats such as the small area of woodland in the east and the eastern boundary watercourse are to be retained and lie outside the proposed development area. In addition, much of the existing amenity grassland is to be retained. The main potential impacts therefore arise from the effects of construction disturbance, noise and pollution.

A series of outline mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are included and these are acceptable. They include: the timing of vegetation removals to avoid the bird nesting season (or supervised removals where undertaken within the nesting season), an updating Water Vole assessment of the watercourse and the supervised removal of longer grassland. There are potentially invasive *Cotoneaster* species within the site and therefore care will need to be taken to prevent the spread of these species within the site.

The BNG assessment provides some details of potential habitat enhancement measures and I am supportive of these and consider that achieving a positive net gain outcome is relatively straightforward.

In summary, I am satisfied that the potential ecological impacts are relatively limited. The main issues will arise during construction and during any pre-construction vegetation clearance. The outline mitigation measures are acceptable and should form the basis for a more detailed ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy.

I would suggest that his strategy includes firm details of all ecological avoidance/mitigation measures as well as full details of all proposed habitat creation and enhancement measures such as hedgerows and wildflower grassland. Details of any proposed green roof will be needed: these can be valuable enhancement features and could contain high-value ruderal habitat for invertebrates and bird species. I would also expect the site to incorporate enhancement features such as bat and bird boxes. I would be especially keen to see nest boxes for Common Swift on the taller buildings. Details of site lighting will be required, demonstrating how semi-natural habitats will be free from excess light spillage.

If you are minded to grant permission, can I suggest that a pre-commencement Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Strategy is secured by condition.

Prior to the commencement of development activities, a detailed Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy shall be in accordance with the outline measures detailed within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Phlorum, February 2022) and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Phlorum, February 2022) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The Strategy shall include (but not necessarily be restricted to): details of all habitat and species mitigation measures; details of the ongoing management of all compensatory/enhancement habitat; location, type and number of all bat/bird boxes and other ecological enhancements; details of lighting. All ecological compensation/enhancement measures shall be installed/implemented in accordance with ecologist's instructions and retained in a location and condition suited to their intended function.

Reason: to protect and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the Conservation Regulations 2017, the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the NERC Act 2006, NPPF and Policy CS 11 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy March 2011.

County Minerals

Contrary to *Paragraph 3.5* of the submitted Planning Statement, the entire proposed development site lies within the mineral and waste consultation area (MWCA) – Minerals section. This area is informed by the mineral safeguarding area (MSA) as

defined through **Policy 15: Safeguarding – mineral resources** of the adopted Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) (HMWP) and indicates where viable, safeguarded mineral resources are likely to be present.

The purpose of this policy is to protect potentially economically viable mineral resource deposits from needless and unnecessary sterilisation. The policy seeks to encourage the recovery, where possible, of potential viable mineral resources prior to development, this concept is known as prior-extraction.

In the case of Langstone Technology Park, due to the fact that the site has previously been developed the concept of prior extraction would not be a viable option for this development. However, the MWPA would still like to encourage full consideration of the opportunities for mineral extraction as part of the proposed development.

Particular opportunities may lie in the recovery of mineral deposits uncovered during the demolition, preparation and/or construction phases of the project, for example through the excavation of footings or trenches for buildings, roads, landscaping and utility infrastructure associated with the development.

The recovered mineral could then either be re-used on site, which could encourage a reduction of excavation waste removed from site as well as inbound materials for construction uses associated with reduced costs, or potentially exported off site to a local mineral operator for further treatment which has potential for additional revenue for the developer. It is recommended that discussions are made between the developer and a local mineral operator at the earliest stage.

There should be no additional vehicle movements associated with these practices, as well as noise, vibration, dust issues.

HCC would therefore request the following conditions to be included in any permission for this planning application, to be delivered through submitted construction management plans or similar, requiring a statement outlining:

- i. a method for ensuring that minerals that can be viably recovered during the development operations are recovered and put to beneficial use; and
- ii. a method to record the quantity of recovered mineral (re-use on site or off site) and to report this data to the MPA.

Hampshire County Council is available to discuss this further with Havant Borough Council, as well as the applicant, in forming a suitable agreement following the receipt of the required information.

Further information on safeguarding and Hampshire County Council's approach to it is available in the adopted Minerals and Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire Supplementary Planning Document, which can be found on our website:
<http://www3.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/planning-policy-home/hmwp-spds.htm>

Crime Prevention -Minor Apps

No comments received

Department of Transport, Highways England

National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such National Highways

works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.

In the case of this development proposal, our interest is in the A27. National Highways has no objection to this planning proposal subject to the following conditions (which have been agreed with the applicant):

Condition 1

Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, full details of drainage and its location relevant to that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority (in consultation with National Highways). Each phase of development shall thereafter be undertaken in strict accordance with the approved details of each phase of development hereby permitted and retained in accordance with the agreed specification. No surface water shall be permitted to run off from the proposed development onto the Strategic Road Network or into any drainage system connected upstream of the Strategic Road Network. No drainage connections from any part of the development hereby permitted may be made to any Strategic Road Network Drainage system'.

Reason: To ensure that the A27 continues to be an effective part of the national system of routes for through traffic in accordance with section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety.

Condition 2:

No phase of development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with National Highways) for that phase. The CEMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- *The proposed construction traffic routes to the site, to be identified on a plan;*
- *Construction Traffic Management Plan (to include the co-ordination of deliveries and plant and materials and the disposing of waste resulting from demolition and/or construction so as to avoid undue interference with the operation of the public highway, particularly during the Monday-Friday AM Peak (0800-0900) and PM Peak (1630-1800) periods);*
- *an estimate of the daily movement of the construction traffic;*
- *the hours of construction work and deliveries;*
- *area(s) for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;*
- *area(s) for the loading and unloading of plant and materials;*
- *area(s) for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;*
- *details of waste management arrangements;*
- *consideration of emissions to air, water and land. Including noise & vibration, dust, general discharges and appropriate mitigation strategies;*
- *the storage of materials and construction waste, including waste recycling where possible;*
- *Risk Assessments and Method Statements for the works; and*
- *contact details of personnel responsible for the construction works.*

Reason: To mitigate any adverse impact from the development on the A27 and to ensure that the A27 continue to be effective parts of the national system of routes for through traffic in accordance with section 10 of the Highways Act 1980 and to satisfy the reasonable requirements of road safety.

Southern Water

Please see the attached extract from Southern Water records showing the approximate position of our existing foul and surface water sewers within the development site. The exact position of the public assets must be determined on site by the applicant in consultation with Southern Water before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

- The 750mm, 675mm and 600mm diameter public foul and surface water sewers requires a clearance of 4 metres on either side of the gravity sewers to protect it from construction works and to allow for future maintenance access.

- No development or tree planting should be carried out within 4 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewers without consent from Southern Water.

- No soakaways, swales, ponds, watercourses or any other surface water retaining or conveying features should be located within 5 metres of public or adoptable gravity sewers.

- All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

Please refer to: southernwater.co.uk/media/3011/stand-off-distances.pdf

In order to protect public sewers, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission; The developer must agree with Southern Water, prior to commencement of the development, the measures to be taken to protect the public sewers.

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

The submitted details indicates the proposed development will result in a net reduction in flows discharged to the sewerage network. The proposed development does not cause any impact on the existing foul water network.

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public foul and surface water sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

To make an application visit Southern Water's Get Connected service: developerservices.southernwater.co.uk and please read our New Connections Charging Arrangements documents which are available on our website via the following link: southernwater.co.uk/developing-building/connection-charging-arrangements

The submitted drainage strategy indicates surface water from Zone 1 will utilise the existing connections to the public surface water sewer. Surface water may be discharged to the existing sewer, provided the rate of discharge to sewer is no greater than existing contributing flows.

Surface water from Zone 2 is being discharged to a river East of the site, the council's technical staff and the Environment Agency should comment on the adequacy of the proposals to discharge surface water to the local watercourse.

Surface water from Zone 3 will utilise the existing connections towards Penner Road. The strategy indicates limiting surface water flow to existing contributing flows. Surface water may be discharged to the existing sewer, provided the rate of discharge to sewer is no greater than existing contributing flows.

The applicant proposes to retain the SuDS within private ownership and maintenance.

Under certain circumstances SuDS will be adopted by Southern Water should this be requested by the developer. Where SuDS form part of a continuous sewer system, and are not an isolated end of pipe SuDS component, adoption will be considered if such systems comply with the latest Design and Construction Guidance (Appendix C) and CIRIA guidance available here:

water.org.uk/sewerage-sector-guidance-approved-documents/

ciria.org/Memberships/The_SuDS_Manual_C753_Chapters.aspx

Where SuDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long-term maintenance of the SuDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system, which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage system.

Thus, where a SuDS scheme is to be implemented, the drainage details submitted to the Local Planning Authority should:

- Specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDS scheme.
- Specify a timetable for implementation.
- Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

This should include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

Land uses such as general hard standing that may be subject to oil/petrol spillages should be drained by means of appropriate oil trap gullies or petrol/oil interceptors.

Our records indicate that an Anti-Flood Device (AFD) is located within the site. Access to an AFD should be maintained at all times. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter with Southern Water Services Operations Team.

This initial assessment does not prejudice any future assessment or commit to any adoption agreements under Section 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Please note that non-compliance with the Design and Construction Guidance will preclude future adoption of the foul and surface water sewerage network on site. The design of drainage should ensure that no groundwater or land drainage is to enter public sewers.

We request that should this planning application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent: Construction of the development shall not commence until details of the proposed means of foul sewerage and surface water disposal have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Southern Water.

For further advice, please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Yeoman Road, Worthing, West Sussex, BN13 3NX (Tel: 0330 303 0119).

Website: southernwater.co.uk or by email at: SouthernWaterPlanning@southernwater.co.uk

Economic Development

No comments received

Engineering/Drainage

No comments received

Environment Agency

Final Comments:

Environment Agency Position We have reviewed the amended Flood Risk Assessment and although the applicant has not calculated the 2082 1 in 100 year (1% AEP) fluvial level, we consider in this incidence our concerns can be satisfactorily addressed through the attached condition.

Subject to the condition below, we therefore withdraw our previous objection. The proposed development will only meet the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements in relation to flood risk if the following planning condition is included.

Condition

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (ref 'Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy Report' produced by Baynham Meikle Partnership Limited) and the following mitigation measures it details:

- Finished floor levels shall be set at 5.90 mAOD for buildings within Zone 1 and 2 north of the link road, and 5.50 mAOD for the buildings within Zone 3B south of the link road

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants

The applicant has stated the design flood levels as follows:

- The 2082 tidal 1 in 200 year (0.5% AEP) event = 3.82 mAOD
- The present day fluvial 1 in 1000 year (0.1% AEP) event = 5.576 mAOD

Whilst the applicant has correctly considered the 2082 1 in 200 year (0.5% AEP) tidal flood level, the applicant has not calculated the 2082 1 in 100 year (1% AEP) fluvial level. However, we have removed our objection due to the following reasons:

- We have calculated the design flood level as broadly similar to the present day 1 in 1000 year (0.1%) flood level.
- The development is classed as less vulnerable by the NPPF
- The applicant has included a 300mm freeboard into the FFL
- The river embankment has a crest level 7.5 to 8.1 mAOD. However, there is a residual risk of this defence failing.

Advice to LPA/Applicant

Flood resistance and resilience

We recommend the use of flood resistance and resilience measures. Physical barriers, raised electrical fittings and special construction materials are just some of the ways you can help reduce flood damage.

To find out which measures will be effective for this development, please contact your building control department. If you'd like to find out more about reducing flood damage, visit the Flood Risk and Coastal Change pages of the planning practice guidance. Further guidance on flood resistance and resilience measures can also be found in:

Government guidance on flood resilient construction

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/flood-resilient-construction-of-new-buildings>

CIRIA Code of Practice for property flood resilience

https://www.ciria.org/Research/Projects_underway2/Code_of_Practice_and_guidance_f_or_property_flood_resilience_.aspx

British Standard 85500 – Flood resistant and resilient construction

<https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail/?pid=000000000030299686>

Environmental Permit

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be obtained for any activities which will take place:

- on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)
- on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres tidal)
- on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
- involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
- in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission

For further guidance please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits> or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm) or by emailing enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk.

The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity.

Signing up for flood warning

The applicant/occupants should phone Floodline on 0345 988 1188 to register for a flood warning, or visit <https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>. It's a free service that provides warnings of flooding from rivers, the sea and groundwater, direct by telephone, email or text message. Anyone can sign up.

Flood warnings can give people valuable time to prepare for flooding – time that allows them to move themselves, their families and precious items to safety. Flood warnings can also save lives and enable the emergency services to prepare and help communities. For practical advice on preparing for a flood, visit <https://www.gov.uk/prepare-for-flooding>. To get help during a flood, visit <https://www.gov.uk/help-during-flood>. For advice on what do after a flood, visit <https://www.gov.uk/after-flood>.

Environmental Health

Thank you for consulting the Pollution team on this application which includes an acoustic assessment prepared by Spectrum Acoustics (report reference PJB9272/21410/V1.1). The assessment predicts that there is likely to be an adverse impact on residential amenity during the day due to noise from fixed plant and general industrial activities unless noise control measures are included in the final design of the site.

At this stage as the end users are unknown it is difficult for the specific mitigation measures required for each unit to be designed. I recommend that the following planning conditions are appended to any permission you are minded to grant in line with the approval for development of the south western section of the site:

1) The external sound level emitted from plant, machinery or equipment at the development shall be equal or lower than the representative background sound level, with noise levels assessed (if necessary) in accordance with BS 4142:2014+A1:2019 at the nearest and/or most affected noise sensitive premises.

2) No externally visible or audible plant, machinery or structures required for ventilation or filtration purposes shall be installed at the premises until and unless details of the external appearance and acoustic and odour prevention performance of the same have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

In addition to the above as the redevelopment of the site includes a significant of demolition and is likely to extend over a long period of time, I also recommend that a condition is attached requiring prior approval of a CEMP before any work commences onsite which includes details on the control of noise and dust during demolition and construction works.

Environmental Health (Environmental Control Officer)

Observations / Comments:

I have now had opportunity to review the application and its supporting documents. I have also reviewed the planning history of the site to inform context, inclusive of previously submitted transport, air quality and contamination assessments. I have also accounted for prior comments made by Environmental Health in connection with recent applications & requests for pre-application advice.

For completeness, I would like to provide comments across a broad range of policy areas insofar as these are related to Air Quality, Pollution & Contamination.

Ground Contamination

A search of records has highlighted the existence of 13 prior contamination assessment reports for which the council holds at least a partial copy. These assessments comprise either intrusive investigations, environmental sampling, qualitative risk assessments, or desk-based assessment / appraisal reports.

In addition, there is one approved remediation method statement (RMS) relating to the phase 1 development area (APP/19/00703, as modified by APP/21/00405), and one subsequent Soil Gas Technical Note relating to the same area. The latter is seeking an amendment to the recommendations of the approved RMS.

It is understood that a further 8 reports have previously been compiled, predominantly dating between 1993 & 2004, however the Council does not hold electronic copies of these reports.

The most recent Baynham Meikle Land Quality Assessment (13023/AB/LQA) recommends further works within specific areas of the site which have either largely been completed & reported within-, or are governed by the recommendations of previously submitted Clancy documents (10/1425/004 & .../005). Both of these Clancy documents pre-date the LQA report. The LQA does not make any specific recommendations in respect of other phases of development, nor does it make a specific case for the dismissal of risks on the basis of prior investigations &/or the previously approved remedial works. It is not clear that the conclusions of the Baynham Meikle LQA Conclusions directly align with the interpretation given at 6.54 of the Barton Willmore Planning Statement.

Given the assessment / investigatory effort previously expended, I was initially reluctant to impose further requirements upon development. However, I note that few of the above-referenced reports relate to the entirety of the technology park site, and those that do incorporate the whole site within the study-area actually cover a significantly larger footprint, meaning that few datapoints are available within curtilage of the technology park site. Of the reports that relate to specific areas of the site, few reports seek to consider the site wholistically, generally focussing the assessment (if not the investigation area) upon the planning red-line area to which the relevant condition relates (e.g. APP/21/00405, Phase 1 area). The spatial scope & resolution of investigations is limited by the presence of existing units & tenancies, and the scope of analysis / assessment is limited by the policy drivers for the investigation (namely the area to which applicable conditions have effect). Given this, there remains scope for contamination assessment to be both relevant and proportionate in respect of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site, as proposed under this outline application.

I would refer you to APP/21/00405 CONS/21/02661 (26/08/2021) & CONS/21/04159 (15/02/2022) for detailed technical comment on the risks identified in the recent reporting. The following extract is possibly of greatest relevance;

“Whilst problematic to the comprehensive wholistic assessment of contamination at the business park, it is acknowledged that the redline area is a constraint which necessarily impacts what may be regarded to be material to the application & effect of planning policy, and that it is not possible to directly address the uncertainty as to the source of the identified [ground-]water contamination [at WS9 & BH5, phase 2 area] under the scope of condition 9 [to APP/21/00405]”

This extract is indicative of there being a degree of residual concern in respect of the principal risk driver for the site (controlled waters receptors), identifying both dissolved phase PAH & TPH within perched groundwater of the secondary aquifer close to a local surface water which may be in continuity. Prior risk assessments have not sought to dismiss these groundwater results as being of negligible significance, and the source of the identified contaminants has not been captured within the detailed phase 1 works (which would suggest identified soil sources are not related to the WS9 & BH5 results). On this basis, it remains likely that a source of contamination remains within un-investigated areas of the site, and there remains credible potential for this source to be material in terms of risk to the controlled waters.

As a secondary risk-driver; Human Health standards to apply to commercial occupants, and the site is- (and the extant buildings are-) sufficiently large as to leave room for a region of contamination to exist in an localised area of the site that could be considered to be significant to either future occupants/employees/contractors in localised areas of the site, or to the building/proposed buildings, or to connected services (especially potable water supplies).

There are therefore two reasons to impose development conditions relating to the assessment & remediation of soil contaminants,

- 1) To dismiss (or make acceptable-) the risk to controlled waters receptors, comprising the aquifers underlying the site and the local surface waters in the vicinity, in particular the ‘Mill Stream’ segment of the Lavant, and;
- 2) To dismiss (or make acceptable-) the risk to the development itself & the future occupants of the land.

Addressing the controlled waters risk (1) need not necessarily impose requirements upon all phases of development; once the risk is dismissed as negligible, or the conceptual model is defined and a remediation plan is in place to reduce the risk to an acceptable level, there would be no need to consider this in future phases.

The human health or buildings risk (2) is relevant to all phases, but is likely to be subject to a relatively high risk benchmark, such that it may be possible to address this aspect through a comprehensive & robust watching brief (for example).

In terms of approach, the controlled waters risk means that it is probably most robust in planning terms to seek to impose a comprehensive contamination condition on all future phases (i.e. excluding access), but to acknowledge that the requirements for future phases could be addressed within works seeking to discharge obligations in earlier phases. It is not my intention to seek to repeat work in all phases simply for

administrative purposes – the aim is to address the risks posed by the site, and the effect of the conditions (and their administration across the development phasing-) should reflect that aim.

On that basis; no in-principle objection arises, subject to the imposition of the following conditions (intended to be applied as B conditions, for discharge as part of a reserved matters application, or to be replicated as a condition of future phase-specific consents for discharge under separate application):

Contamination (Modified – omitting EDS) [B.1]

Prior to the commencement of any specific phase of development hereby approved (other than any site clearance, demolition of above-ground structures, or consequential works for the purpose of ensuring structural stability of retained construction-), an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination at the site, whether originating from within or outside the curtilage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The assessment may comprise separate reports as appropriate, but unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall include;

1) Site investigation appropriate to both the previous & approved uses of the site, to provide sufficient data and information to adequately identify & characterise any physical contamination on or affecting the site, and to inform an appropriate assessment of the risks to future occupants.

2) The results of an appropriate risk assessment based upon (1), and where unacceptable risks are identified, a Remediation Strategy that includes; • appropriately considered remedial objectives, • an appraisal of remedial &/or risk mitigation options, having due regard to sustainability, and; • clearly defined proposals for mitigation of the identified risks.

3) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out any Remediation Strategy required under (2) are complete, identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance of engineered mitigation measures, and arrangements for contingency action.

All elements shall be adhered to unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to-, is not put at unacceptable risk from- nor is adversely affected by-, unacceptable levels of contamination. This condition is in line with policy DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], and paragraphs 183-185 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. Prior investigations suggest that soil contamination may be present within previously un-investigated areas of the site that could pose a risk to controlled waters, buildings & services, and/or future occupants"

Verification (Standard) [B.2]

Prior to the occupation of any relevant part of the permitted development, any verification report required in accordance with condition [B.1] shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan, and must demonstrate that site remediation criteria have been met. Where longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages is identified as being necessary, the report shall clearly set out plans for monitoring, provision for maintenance, relevant triggers, and contingency actions (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan").

The long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to-, is not put at unacceptable risk from- nor is adversely affected by-, unacceptable levels of contamination. This condition is in line with policy DM10 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, DM17 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) [2014], and paragraphs 183-185 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. Prior investigations suggest that soil contamination may be present within previously un-investigated areas of the site that could pose a risk to controlled waters, buildings & services, and/or future occupants"

Informative – Guide to scope of required Site Investigation

"Conditions numbered [1] & [2] omit any strict requirement for a desk-based assessment. This omission in the interests of flexibility, and to avoid any requirement for repetition of assessment work within subsequent development phases. However, given the scale of buildings to be demolished, the design of the required intrusive investigations may be helpfully informed by the existing body of investigatory work, alongside a phase-specific site walkover/building inspection prior to demolition, & research into previous business operations. It is also recommended that phase-specific risk assessments consider relevant results from previous investigations, where these might be material to the site conceptual model &/or any specific source-pathway-target linkage (whether or not those results fall within the red-line area for that phase). The Council does not expect repetition of work in future phases where risks to common receptors have been adequately addressed in prior development phases – it will be acceptable to refer to previously approved documentation in support of discharging reserved matters conditions. This may apply to both investigation & assessment reports, or to remediation & risk mitigation provisions"

Air Quality; Development as Source – Impacts from Transport (Air Quality Assessment, Transport Assessment & Technical Note)

The Phlorum Air Quality Assessment (11042.S.v1) has accounted for pre-application advice and has been based upon the overall traffic uplift relative the existing levels of occupancy, rather than limiting it's scope to the assessment of the net uplift between the theoretical generation of the current consented use relative to the future proposed use. In this way, the assessment is representative of the actual possible change relative to existing air quality, representing best practice.

The baseline traffic figures are consistent across the road links modelled, based upon an assumed 53/47% West/East access utilisation, and 2011 travel-to-work census data (informing route allocation). The development uplift is expected to be 2659 AADT (approx. 5% HDV) based upon a moderate emissions worst case use-class allocation. These baseline assumptions are agreed to be reasonable.

The model has been appropriately validated against local monitoring data, and was found to be under-estimating environmental concentrations, and has been adjusted accordingly.

Receptors within Portsmouth City area have been included within the assessment, based upon conservative assumptions. It is not entirely clear why Portsmouth area receptors have been included within the model, where local residential receptors on Brookside Road (adjacent to the site West access) have been excluded from the model.

The results have been compared to industry guidance (IAQM/EPUK) that pre-dates recent changes in WHO health-based advice; concluding negligible impacts with <+1% relative change at all modelled receptors when benchmarked against the current air quality standards. However, NPPF policies are not specifically linked to the current air quality standards, and are instead defined either in relative terms, in terms that are linked to public health. In this respect, it is relevant to refer to the WHO advice for context.

Re-benchmarking the model results against WHO advice (using the IAQM/EPUK significance matrix) results in a maximum relative-change of 'Substantial' for NO₂ (+3%), borderline 'Moderate/Substantial' for PM_{2.5} (+2%) and 'Moderate' for PM₁₀ (<+1%). The elevated relative % change is the result of a lower benchmark, and the increased assessed magnitude of impact is principally driven by the baseline conditions being substantially in-excess of the WHO recommended exposures under the 'no development' scenario.

I have used the results of the submitted report to (very roughly) approximate the likely relative impact at the omitted Brookside Road receptors. I would estimate that the model would return a value for NO₂ of around +0.75% of current air quality standards, at a baseline concentration within the 76-94% range ('Negligible' under IAQM benchmarked against the current air quality standards). Against WHO recommendations, the relative change would be around +3% at >110%, representing a substantial relative change, for the same reasons as above.

There is a lack of clarity as to the weight that should be given to WHO recommended exposure limits – it must be acknowledged that the WHO limits do not account for either the cost or feasibility of meeting the limits, and that the government has not yet confirmed whether the WHO PM_{2.5} limit will be adopted (as expected) under the statutory instruments required to be made under the Environment Act '21. It remains unclear whether any further pollutants will be included within the discretionary instruments which may be made under the Environment Act '21. The comparison above does however serve to highlight the mis-alignment of statutory limits with the most recent public health advice, alongside the importance of achieving net emissions reduction (environmental / air-quality betterment-) under the relative & health based NPPF policies. I think that it is appropriate to pursue the aim of emissions mitigation/offsetting in preference to the restriction of development.

I have reviewed the Transport Assessment & Technical Note, with a particular interest in the use of barriers to prevent peak hours rat running, and the junction monitoring/modelling to consider the potential for network effects that could have disproportionate impact on existing traffic & transport emissions. The transport technical note presents a junction peak-hours turning count for the Brookside Rd. roundabout only – further locations on Langstone Road are highlighted on a supplied plan, implying that surveys have been undertaken, however the data has not been presented. Junction modelling provides no cause for concern, but again, only the Brookside Road roundabout has been considered in this most recent assessment.

The DTA Transport Assessment (RJM/AK/20428-04c TA , 2019) Included an assessment for an overall site transport demand within -5% of the total site transport demand represented by the current proposals, and RFC's >1% (i.e. junction operating over-capacity-) were only noted on the site access road (and not on the local strategic road network). Right turn from A3023 Langstone was above ideal levels (RFC 0.85), and would therefore be perceived to be congested during the AM peak (only). It is understood that the Langstone Access barrier system would operate during peak AM hours only, and this should both improve the identified issue, and serve as a meaningful mitigation of the impact of the development access on air quality.

I have considered the impact of rat running traffic at other times of day, and on balance, traffic taking advantage of this route might actually displace emissions from-, and reduce congestion at- other busy town centre locations (e.g. Park Road South/Solent Road), and may have a positive impact on the air quality in those locations. In this way, it may be preferable to permit public through-traffic, rather than seeking to exclude it at all times. I acknowledge the arrangements outlined within the transport technical note, and consider that the barrier proposals represent a good solution on balance.

No objections arise to the principle of development, subject to the scheme seeking an appropriate degree of offset of development emissions.

Air Quality; Emissions Offsetting (Sustainability & Energy, Planning Statement, Design Principles, Travel Plan)

The design principles for the development are acknowledged to represent good practice, and I note some significant commitments which will directly reduce local emissions of air pollutants.

Envision, Sustainability & Energy Statement;

The desire to put 'sustainability at the heart of proposals' is notable, and a key component of this is the drive for energy efficiency through decentralisation of space heating and the specification of Heat Pumps as a primary heat source. Combined with the 100% electric water heating strategy, this aims to eliminate on-site combustion to serve heat demand and will directly reduce emissions to air from buildings. It is understood that these systems will be supported by a solar PV installation, storage batteries, and heat recovery ventilation to offices and ancillary uses. The integration of these technologies is consistent with the sustainability aspirations, and the targeting of EPC A+ / BREEAM excellent rating, albeit that 4.47 places a significant caveat on the latter design principle.

In terms of possible improvements, I would highlight that the efficiency of proposed heat pumps could be improved by the context of their installation; e.g. by placing them on or near water or other high thermal mass materials which may take advantage from solar gain, or by placing waste heat extract outlets in the vicinity of the pumps. There are also foreseeable opportunities for utilisation of wastewater heat recovery within the scheme, particularly within the gym and within the high-quality facilities for cyclists which are both likely to include showers.

There could also be opportunities at the reserved matters stages to incorporate recovery of waste heat – e.g. through thermal storage and re-use. Depending on the levels of available heat, such a system could be serve a single plot, or multiple plots. The viability of such schemes would be dependent upon the nature of the tenancy,

and so would only be realisable at the reserved matters stage where the development is not speculative.

Given the aim to eliminate on-site combustion for these purposes the above opportunities, alongside the proposed Solar PV/Battery systems, would serve to contribute to a reduction of demand for local network STOR facilities (which generate peaking electricity using fossil sources) and will contribute to marginal reductions in emissions in the Southmoor Lane / Harts Farm Way area (where local STOR's are located).

Overall the scheme is well conceived, and sets a sound set of design principles to inform future reserved matters applications. Proposals outlines are supported on Air Quality grounds.

Planning Statement, Design Principles;

The 'hard' measures for supporting access to the site for cyclists and pedestrians are supported on Air Quality grounds, as they should serve to make sustainable and active (zero-emission) transport modes as convenient as possible for employees. These measures will also improve the local network for the general public, will serve to improve network connectivity in line with policy objectives, and may extend the benefits in emissions reduction to a small proportion of trips on the local road network.

The EV charging provisions outlined (10% charging provision, + additional 20% spaces passively equipped) is considered to be a proportionate response to accommodate the likely medium-term need. EV charging provision is particularly compatible with the site energy strategy.

These measures are considered to contribute to the offsetting of transport-related emissions and are supported.

Travel Plan (Framework);

The travel plan presents some relatively modest mode-shift targets, which contrast with the level of ambition expressed elsewhere within the submission. I would consider the site to be sufficiently sustainably located as to accommodated more challenging targets.

Otherwise, the plan represents best practice, with a robust hierarchy established between site management & tenant's responsibilities, a clear relationship with public authorities for oversight, and some robust options for remedial action.

Some simple, but nevertheless innovative & unusual travel-plan provisions are included, and it is noteworthy that the outline travel survey aims to capture broader information about working patterns, work-related travel, and the drivers for travel choices. This survey structure should provide the best opportunity for addressing barriers to the uptake of sustainable and active travel modes.

In terms of potential improvements, I note that there are no mode shift targets to 'other' modes of travel, and the plan does not explicitly consider personal e-transport options. 0% APR loans & mileage allowance provisions for cyclists could be extended to users of e-scooters (or similar), and the site could explore hosting a e-scooter hire stand, to provide a link to local rail facilities (in partnership with commercial provider).

Given the employee-density at the site, a small car club scheme could be successful and would be a welcome addition. As the travel plan is a framework document, there will be opportunities to incorporate improvements (to targets, or provisions) at future stages – it is not necessary to secure revisions under this application.

It is anticipated that a phase specific travel plan will be a requirement of reserved matters applications, and it may be appropriate to secure this as a 'B' Condition where this isn't likely to form part of one of the required supporting documents (e.g. a transport assessment).

Overall;

The design principles, energy strategy, sustainability appraisal and transport strategy appear well-integrated, and in line with best practice. It is considered that this package of proposals will be capable of materially reducing the emissions associated with the site, including those associated with proposed buildings, with employee & customer travel, and associated with the contribution of the site to local power-demand. For these reasons, the proposals are supported on Air Quality Grounds.

Construction Environmental Management Plan (Framework CEMP)

It should be noted that the CEMP outlines the principles upon which phase-specific plans should be based. It does not comprise a detailed plan in & of itself and would be insufficient for direct application to specific construction works, other than as a 'live' document which would be developed into a practical / operational document for direct application by site staff.

This notwithstanding, I note that section 7 specifically relates to hydrology & protection of aquatic resources, making provision for protection of hydraulic effects, and water quality. Section 9 concerns pollution incident control measures, outlining the key principles of contractor responsibility for providing incident control measures, and the requirement for procedures to be agreed with the Local planning Authority. The basic provisions referenced include measures often omitted, are appropriate to a site with a nearby surface water, and represent a reasonable starting point for future phase-specific plans.

I note that Highways England has proposed a comprehensive condition to secure a full CEMP prior to each development phase, presumably envisaged as a 'B' condition (either for discharge as part of a reserved matters application, or to be replicated as a condition of future phase-specific consents for discharge under separate application).

Both Natural England & Environmental Health (amenity / nuisance) has alluded to the need for a CEMP condition, but neither has proposed specific wording. In terms of the specific requirements of Environmental Health, I can confirm that the wording proposed by Highways England should suffice without need for modification. In respect of the requirements of Natural England, the Highways England wording omits only 'visual screening for SPA birds'. I would suggest that requirement should be added to the list given in the Highways England condition.

No objections arise.

Pollution; Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy

I note the design principles for separate drainage catchments, each with separate discharges to the existing public network or local watercourses. The strategy principles propose proprietary oil interceptor units for each catchment to ensure that 'water quality will be raised prior to being discharged'. Subject to a suitable specification, appropriate positioning on the network & maintenance scheduling, this provision should provide adequate pollution protection.

It is recognised that the drainage strategy is subject to detailed design, and a 'full drainage strategy and drainage modelling exercise will be submitted in support of future reserved matters applications'. I am not certain that this text reflects the aspects of the development that are not reserved – namely the drainage system serving the site access road.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has proposed a detailed planning condition, which I can confirm includes appropriate provisions to ensure adequate pollution control. Given the uncertainty alluded to above, it is assumed that the LLFA should be applied both as an 'A' condition and as a 'B' condition, applying both to the construction / modification of the internal access road, and to reserved matters stages.

No objections arise subject to the application of the LLFA-proposed condition. Environmental Health would wish to be consulted on the discharge of this condition, at the appropriate time.

Summary;

Proposals are supported on Air Quality Grounds. No material objections to the proposals subject to the application of the following conditions;

- Modified CEMP condition, incorporating the Natural England requirements in to the detailed provisions of the wording proposed by Highways England
- An un-modified Surface Water Drainage Scheme conditions, using the wording proposed by the LLFA
- A full contamination conditions suite & informative, as outlined above

Hampshire Fire & Rescue

Description of Works:

HIWFRS understands that the project involves outline Planning Application for Phased demolition of existing buildings and the erection of new flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g)(I) -(iii)/B2/B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)), and associated works.

I confirm that Hampshire & IOW Fire and Rescue Service (HIWFRS) has received your application, dated 11 March 2021. The inspector named above has considered the information provided and has made the following comments:

Building Regulations: Access for Firefighting

Access and facilities for Fire Service Appliances and Firefighters should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations.

Hampshire Act 1983 Section 12 – Access for Fire Service

Access **to** the proposed site should be in accordance with Hampshire Act 1983 Sect, 12 (Access to buildings **within the site** will be dealt with as part of the building regulations application at a later stage). Access roads **to** the site should be in accordance with Approved Document B5 of the current Building Regulations.

Fire and Rescue Services Act 2004

The following recommendations are advisory only and do not form part of any current legal requirement of this Authority.

Access for High-reach Appliances

High reach appliances currently operated by the HIWFRS exceed the maximum requirements given in Section 17 of the Approved Document B. When considering high rise buildings these variations should be considered as additions and incorporated as follows. Structures such as bridges, which a high-reach appliance may need to cross should have a maximum carrying capacity of 26 tonnes. Where the operation of a high reach vehicle is envisaged, a road or hard standing is required 6m wide. In addition, the road or hard standing needs to be positioned so that its nearer edge is not less than 3m from the face of the building.

Water Supplies

Additional water supplies for firefighting may be necessary. You should contact the Water Management Team, Hampshire & IOW Fire and Rescue Headquarters, Leigh Road, Eastleigh, SO50 9SJ (hydrants@hantsfire.gov.uk) to discuss your proposals.

Fire Protection

HIWFRS would strongly recommend that consideration is given to installation of an Automatic Water Fire Suppression Systems (AWFSS) to promote life safety and property protection within the premises.

HIWFRS is fully committed to promoting Fire Protection Systems for both business and domestic premises. Support is offered to assist all in achieving a reduction of loss of life and the impact of fire on the wider community.

Testing of Fire Safety Systems

HIWFRS strongly recommends that, upon commissioning, all fire safety systems are fully justified, fully tested, and shown to be working as designed. Thereafter, their effectiveness should be reconfirmed periodically throughout their working lifecycles.

Firefighting and the Environment

Should a serious un-suppressed fire occur on the premises, the water environment may become polluted with 'fire water run-off' that may include foam. The Service will liaise with the Environment Agency at any incident where they are in attendance and under certain circumstances, where there is a serious risk to the environment, a 'controlled burn' may take place. This of course could lead to the total loss of the building and its contents.

Premises' occupiers have a duty to prevent and mitigate damage to the water

environment from 'fire water run off' and other spillages.

Timber-framed Buildings

These types of buildings are particularly vulnerable to severe fire damage and fire spread during the construction phase.

The UK Timber Frame Association publication '16 Steps to Fire Safety on Timber Frame Construction Sites' provides guidance on this issue and is available from:

<https://ttf.co.uk/download/16-steps-fire-safety-timber-frame-construction-sites/>

This guidance should be read in conjunction with the 'Joint Code of Practice on the Protection from Fire of Construction Sites and Buildings Undergoing Renovation', published by the Construction Confederation and The Fire Protection Association (Sixth Edition, ISBN 1-902790-33-2)

Copies of the 'Joint Codes of Practice' and useful sister publication, 'Construction Site Fire Prevention Checklist' (Second edition, ISBN 1-902790-32-4), are available for purchase from the Fire Protection Association: (www.thefpa.co.uk) and from the Construction Industry Press:

([Publications for Construction Professionals and Builders | CIP Books](#))

Hampshire Highways

Further Comments:

Further to the Highway Authority's response dated 6th May 2022, the applicant has produced a Technical Note (TN), Walking, Cycling and Horse-riding Assessment (WCHAR) and Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA1). Discussions have subsequently taken place between the Highway Authority and the applicant to agree pedestrian and cycle improvements to be delivered as part of the development in line with the measures identified within the WCHAR.

Following the review of the latest information and discussions with the applicant, the Highway Authority wish to make the following comments.

Sustainable Transport Provision

The applicant has undertaken a WCHAR to audit the existing walking and cycling routes around the site to Havant rail station.

The WCHAR highlighted a number of measures which could be provided to improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility to the site. It has subsequently been agreed that the following measures will be provided to improve the pedestrian and cycle facilities around the site:

- Widening of the existing footway on the northern side of the eastern access road to 3m to provide shared use facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. This will be coupled with a widened crossing point at the mouth of the junction with Langstone Road and the widening works to Footpath 51 which will provide a continuous route for cyclists heading from Hayling Island towards Havant.
- Wayfinding improvements around the site to direct pedestrians and cyclists towards

key facilities. The full extent and location of the wayfinding will be addressed via a suitably worded condition.

- To meet LTN 1/20 standards, the existing railings by the A27 underpass will be raised to a minimum 1.5m in height. Similarly, the parapets over the existing bridge on the eastern access road into Langstone Technology Park will be raised to at least 1.5m given that this will now provide cycle connectivity between Footpath 51 and Langstone Road.
- To the north of the A27 underpass, the staggered barriers will be removed to improve cycle accessibility.

The applicant has agreed to undertake the improvement works to Footpath 51 via a Section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority. The footpath should be surfaced to Type 1 construction standard and must feature street lighting columns to ensure that the route is street lit for both pedestrians and cyclists. The remaining works alongside Footpath 51 and the cycle improvement works at the junction with Langstone Road will also need to be implemented through a Section 278 agreement. These matters will be secured within the Section 106 agreement.

To ensure that the public have the necessary rights to pass along the private access road between Langbrook Farm and Langstone Technology Park, the applicant has agreed to the principle of wording within the Section 106 agreement which will grant pedestrians and cyclists with the rights to utilise the footway/cycleway in perpetuity. Through the provision of these rights and the wider cycle improvement works, a continuous cycle route will be created between Havant and Hayling Island.

Personal Injury Accident Data

Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data has gathered revised accident data from Hampshire Constabulary. A notable cluster of accidents have been recorded at the A27/Langstone Road roundabout, with a smaller cluster of accidents occurring at the Brockhampton Road/Brookside Road roundabout. Hampshire County Council's Safety Engineering Team have reviewed these locations and do not consider mitigation measures necessary at this stage from the proposed development.

Barrier Control and Internal Site Layout

The applicant has provided further clarification regarding the proposed operation of the internal site barriers. Each tenant will be allocated a number of vehicle registrations which will subsequently be allowed to pass through the ANPR barriers. The barriers will monitor usage and the level of vehicle usage will be adjusted where necessary to provide a stable daily figure.

In the event that a vehicle which is not on the whitelist attempts to gain entry, a security guard will be stationed at the barriers whilst they are down who will instruct the vehicle to turn around when they enter the site to exit via the same set of barriers. Anyone who regular attempts to gain entry when not whitelisted will no longer be able to gain entry to the site. The Highway Authority considers this arrangement to be suitable and will be secured via a suitably worded condition.

Swept path drawings have been provided to show the movements of articulated vehicles at a 1:500 scale to allow for easier analysis of the track plots. The Highway Authority have reviewed the tracking drawings and note that the movements do not overhang the footways throughout the site. The tracking is therefore considered acceptable. It is also noted that the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit undertaken for the internal site layout did not pick up on any safety issues with the proposed layout, aside from the need to provide dropped kerb and tactile paving crossings within the

development. It is considered that these matters can be incorporated into the final internal layout before the planning condition is signed off.

Trip Generation

It is noted that the original Transport Assessment contained an error and should have read that that figures were for the existing lawful uses only before the 2019 permission was implemented.

Junction Modelling

As requested, the applicant has undertaken junction modelling at the Brockhampton Road/Brookside Road roundabout. To establish baseline traffic conditions, surveys were undertaken at the junction in November 2021 which were subsequently growthed to 2027 to provide a future year scenario.

The modelling demonstrates that the worst-case RFC at the roundabout is 0.67 on the Harts Farm Way approach in the AM peak hour 2027 scenario. The modelling demonstrates that the roundabout will continue to operate within capacity following occupation of the site. The modelling is therefore considered acceptable.

Travel Plan

The applicant has submitted an updated Travel Plan which addresses the comments raised within the Highway Authority's original response.

The approved Travel Plan will be secured through the Section 106 agreement, alongside the approval and monitoring fees and the cash deposit.

Recommendation

The applicant has suitably addressed the Highway Authority's previous comments. The Highway Authority therefore raise no objection to the proposed development, subject to the following conditions and Section 106 obligations.

Conditions

- To provide the final details of the pedestrian and cycle link between Langstone Road and Footpath 51, as indicatively shown in drawing number 2010053-11 Rev B, supported by a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, for approval by the Highway Authority. Not to occupy the development until the approved works have been implemented.

Reason: To provide cycle connectivity to the site.

- Prior to commencement of development, details for the on site provision of cycle storage facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure the adequate provision of on site facilities.

- A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with Hampshire County Council Highway Authority) before development commences. This should include construction traffic routes and their management and control, parking and turning provision to be made on site, measures to prevent mud being deposited on the highway, adequate provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway, and a programme for construction.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety.

- No development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a Management Plan for the proposed traffic barriers within the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety.

S106 Obligations

- Prior to commencement of development, to enter into a Section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority for the improvement works to Footpath 51 and the cycle improvement works at the site access road junction with Langstone Road, as principally shown in drawing number 2010053-11 Rev B. To implement these works to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority prior to occupation of the development;
- Payment of the Travel Plan approval (£1,500) and monitoring (£15,000) fees prior to occupation of development; and
- Provision of a bond, or other form of financial surety, in respect of measures within the Travel Plan prior to occupation.

Original Comments: **Officer Comment:** Included for completeness

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the complete re-development of Langstone Technology Park. Planning permission was previously granted under reference APP/19/00703 (and subsequently varied under reference APP/21/00405) to allow for the partial demolition of some of the existing buildings and replacement with 11,290m² of flexible employment floorspace. The proposed development would result in wholesale demolition onsite, with new buildings constructed to accommodate flexible employment space and a new internal road layout to suit.

The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) to address the highway implications of the proposed development. Following a review of this document, the Highway Authority wish to make the following comments.

Planning History

The Highway Authority previously recommended no objection to the re-development of the technology park under planning references APP/19/00703 and APP/21/00405, subject to planning conditions and Section 106 obligations. The following measures were secured:

- Payment of the £67,500 contribution towards the upgrade of Footpath 51 prior to commencement of development;
- Provision of appropriate signage to tie the upgrade Footpath 51 to the existing shared use facilities on Langstone Road with details of the signage requirements to be agreed prior to occupation;
- Payment of the £25,000 contribution towards the bus infrastructure upgrade prior to occupation of development;
- Langstone Road right turn lane works and additional signage at the roundabout to be implemented prior to occupation of development;
- Payment (by developer) of HCC fees in respect of approval (£1,500) and monitoring (£15,000) of the Framework Travel Plan prior to occupation; and
- Provision of a bond, or other form of financial surety, in respect of measures within

the Travel Plan prior to occupation.

Conditions were also secured for the provision of a CTMP and traffic barriers within the site to restrict access from Langstone Road between 07:30 – 09:00.

Following the demolition of some of the existing buildings and replacement with flexible use industrial buildings, the total floorspace amounted to 64,330m². The follow up Section 73 application marginally reduced the total quantum of floorspace allowed on site.

Pre-Application

The applicant previously engaged in pre-application discussions with the Highway Authority. The Highway Authority requested the following additional information in support of the complete re-development of the site:

- Replication of the previous S106 obligations and conditions secured under the previous planning permission;
- Provision of a WCHAR to identify any pedestrian and cycling deficits in the vicinity of the site;
- Investigation into the upgrade of Footpath 51 to the north of the development to cater for cyclists;
- Revisions to the internal layout to prevent through-traffic;
- Latest 5 year accident data from Hampshire Constabulary;
- Turning counts to understand the distribution of traffic from the site;
- Junction modelling for the Harts Farm Way/Brockhampton Road Roundabout and Langstone Road site access, with consideration given towards a mitigation scheme at the latter; and
- Provision of a travel plan.

These requirements are referred to throughout this response.

Sustainable Modes of Transport

Walking and Cycling

Within the Highway Authority's pre-application response, the applicant was required to carry out a WCHAR as part of any planning application supporting development at the site. However, it is noted that a WCHAR has not been undertaken as part of the application. The Highway Authority therefore requires a WCHAR to assess the quality of local walking and cycling routes in the vicinity of the site to identify whether any improvements are required. The WCHAR should be carried out in accordance with Hampshire County Council's Technical Guidance TG19 document.

Notwithstanding the requirement for a WCHAR, the applicant has carried out a high-level assessment of walking and cycling facilities currently available to the site. The appraisal reiterates the need to upgrade Footpath 51 to cater for cyclists as well as pedestrians, a position corroborated by the Highway Authority. The widened path will need to be supported by signage to direct cyclists from the existing facilities along Langstone Road to the link under the A27, as secured within the previous permission. To supplement the proposed signage, the existing shared use facilities on Langstone Road will need to be extended to provide a safe and continuous route for cyclists into the site. The access road does not currently provide any cycle facilities which extend from the existing provision, nor is there a safe location for cyclists to access the upgraded facilities provided along Footpath 51. The cycle access strategy from the

east will need to be revisited to ensure that a holistic, LTN 1/20 compliant scheme is achieved which extends from the existing facilities on Langstone Road.

The applicant should also engage with the Highway Authority to discuss the contribution value towards the upgrade of Footpath 51 in light of the increase in construction costs since the funding was previously secured.

It is noted that no crossing facilities are provided at the point at which Footpath 51 crosses the eastern access road to access the footpath running to the west of Langbrook Close and Brookmead Way. This matter should be identified within the WCHAR and addressed via provision of crossing facilities.

To the west of the site, there is a lack of signage to direct cyclists to and from local cycle facilities. The WCHAR should also review the infrastructure to the west of the site, with signage and upgrades proposed where necessary to ensure that cyclists have a clear and continuous route to the development.

A walking isochrone is provided within Appendix A of the TA to identify incremental walking distances from the site, although no facilities have been identified within the plan to demonstrate which facilities are located within a walkable distance from the development. Whilst this work was undertaken as part of the previous planning application and the Highway Authority are satisfied that facilities are available, the WCHAR will need to be undertaken to confirm whether any missing pedestrian and cycle links need to be implemented to ensure that the facilities are accessible. The WCHAR should also commit to improving wayfinding for the local walking and cycling routes around the site, particularly in the north eastern corner where Footpath 51 connects with Footpath 50.

Bus and Rail

The nearest bus stops are currently available on Langstone Road, serving the regular service into Havant. Through the previous planning permission, the Highway Authority secured a £25,000 contribution towards the relocation and upgrade of the northbound bus stop, as previously identified within the Hayling Island Transport Assessment. This scheme has recently been undertaken by Hampshire County Council to address safety concerns regarding the previous proximity of the bus stop to the pedestrian island on Langstone Road. Therefore, the monies previously secured towards the northbound bus stop improvements should be utilised towards improving the southbound bus stop, including the pedestrian and cycle links from the site to this facility as this will also provide a key facility to serve the site.

Havant rail station is located approximately 1.3km to the north of the site. Frequent train services are available at the station, meaning it presents a viable alternative mode of travel to the site.

Personal Injury Accident Data

The applicant has obtained personal injury accident (PIA) data from Crashmap which is not an accepted source of accident data in Hampshire. The applicant should obtain the most recently available accident data from Hampshire Constabulary covering a 5-year period. A supporting analysis should be provided to confirm whether there are any potential accident clusters which may be exacerbated by the proposed development.

Proposed Development

As noted previously, the development proposals include the demolition of existing buildings (51,755m² floorspace) for replacement with 63,290m² of flexible employment floorspace. The proposal also includes 3,000m² dedicated towards office space.

Access to the site will be retained from both Harts Farm Way and Langstone Road. To replicate the previous planning condition which restricted access to the site from Langstone Road between 07:30 – 09:00, the applicant is proposing to implement traffic barriers on Brookside Road, operated via ANPR. The ANPR system will only allow access from Langstone Road during the aforementioned timeframe for pre-approved vehicles only. Clarity is sought from the applicant on how these pre-approved vehicles will be identified, including what the cap on these vehicles is and how vehicles without access who errantly attempt to access the site via Langstone Road will be expected to re-route should they reach the barrier with vehicle(s) waiting behind. Confirmation of how this system will be monitored and maintained in perpetuity is also required from the applicant.

The proposed site layout has been appended to the TA in drawing number PL 005. The internal layout of the site has been set out to provide a continuous and direct east/west route through the development between Langstone Road and Brookside Road. The layout approved under the previous application did not provide a direct and continuous route through the development, nor did it allow larger vehicles to be able to route from the east to the west. The Highway Authority are concerned that the proposed management methods will not be sufficient for discouraging rat running through the site given the site layout. Alongside the proposed flow barriers, further clarification is sought from the applicant on how the park will be managed to ensure that east-west (and vice versa) movements through the development are appropriately managed.

The internal site layout has been designed to accommodate movements to each unit for articulated vehicles. Appendix E contains tracking for two articulated vehicles passing concurrently throughout the site. The track plots have not been provided separately, meaning it is hard to differentiate between the two movements; however, it appears that the vehicles overhang the footways throughout the site, including through the junction to the west of the access through Brookside Road. Given the nature of the park, it is likely that two articulated vehicles may meet throughout the site, thereby creating a potential safety concern for pedestrians. Revised vehicle tracking should be provided to clearly demonstrate the tracking movements for each vehicle. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should also be undertaken to confirm whether any safety concerns arise from the proposed layout.

Footways are provided throughout the site, providing east/west permeability through the development. A connection is provided to the north eastern corner of the development to link into the upgraded Footpath 51 facilities. The previous permission secured this link as a 3m wide shared use route which appears to be replicated within the indicative masterplan provided in Appendix D. Clarity is sought from the applicant that this is correct.

The current site layout requires cyclists to route on carriageway through private roads to get from Brookside Road to Langstone Road, and vice versa. It is noted that cyclists will be allowed to through the site although it is unclear how this will be signed and made available in perpetuity. Clarity is also sought from the applicant on this point.

Phasing Plan

The applicant has set out a proposed phasing plan for the site within the TA, noting that it is their intention to demolish B6000 first to allow for the commencement of construction of the new access route through the site.

The Highway Authority notes the potential flexibility in the phasing strategy and will require a Construction Traffic Management Plan which sets out a clear management strategy for the construction of the development once the applicant has set a strategy moving forward.

Trip Generation

The proposed trip generation for the development has been assessed against the recently approved generation under the consented permission.

To forecast the trip generation from the site, the applicant has utilised the trip rates agreed through the 2019 application which is considered acceptable. The trip rates spanned a number of different land uses to reflect the proposed usage of different buildings on site.

During pre-application discussions, the applicant presented a total trip generation figure of 864 in the AM peak hour and 740 in the PM peak hour for the permitted use. It is noted that the TA now presents a permitted trip use of 901 in the AM peak hour and 768 in the PM peak hour. Because the assessment does not disaggregate the trip rates, it is unclear why the numbers have changed from those previously presented. The Highway Authority requires clarity before the trip rates under the extant permission are accepted.

Two proposed development trip generation scenarios are presented: proposed development assuming all B1b land use and proposed development incorporating 3000m² of B1a office space. As the latter scenario presents a more robust trip assessment, the Highway Authority considers that these figures should be brought forward for consideration. A summary table is included below which sets out the different trip generation figures currently being considered.

Land Use	AM Peak (two-way)	PM Peak (two-way)
Existing Use (Pre-App Figure)	864	740
Existing Use (Current Figure)	901	768
Proposed Development (Assuming B1a)	928	712

The TA summarises that junction modelling is not required for the proposed development because the net trip impact is an additional 27 trips in the AM peak hour and minus 56 in the PM peak hour. However, when assessed against the figures provided at pre-app, the proposed development would result in an increase of 64 in the AM peak hour and reduction of 28 trips in the PM peak hour.

Whilst there are restrictions in place to limit the level of vehicular traffic utilising the Langstone Road site access between 07:30 – 09:00 (therefore covering the AM peak hour), the trip increase within the AM peak hour would require junction modelling for the Harts Farm Way/Brockhampton Road Roundabout.

During pre-app discussions, the applicant intended to investigate improvement schemes at the site access/Langstone Road junction to improve the existing capacity constraints identified through the previous planning application. The TA does not provide any commentary on this point, nor have any further discussions been held with the Highway Authority. Clarity is sought from the applicant as to why an improvement scheme is no longer being looked at given the known capacity constraints at this junction.

Travel Plan

The Highway Authority have reviewed the Framework Travel Plan (FTP) provided in support of the application.

The following amendments are required to the Travel Plan before it can be considered acceptable.

Background

A section should be included which references national and local policy documents relevant to the TP. These may include, but are not limited to:

- National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
- Planning Practice Guidance 'Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements' (2014)
- IHT's 'Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot' (2000)
- CIHT's 'Buses in Urban Developments' (2018)
- DfT's Manual for Streets (2007)
- Hampshire's Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 (2013)
- Hampshire County Council's 'A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans' (2009)
- Hampshire County Council's Parking Standards
- LPA Parking SPD (where applicable)
- LPA Clean Air Policy (where applicable)
- LPA Local Plan (where applicable)
- LPA Electric Vehicle SPD (where applicable)
- Neighbourhood Plans (where applicable)

This section should also reference the developer's policies on sustainable travel. If the developer does not have a policy on sustainable travel, a statement of support for the aims of the Travel Plan from a senior member of staff at XLB Property would suffice.

Targets

A table of targets should be included in the FTP; please see the example table below. A percentage decrease or increase should be given to each travel mode. The baseline for these targets can be arrived at by using the MSOA data from the 2011 census or existing survey results for similar developments in the area.

	Baseline	3rd Year	5th Year
Car Driver			
Car Passenger			
Bus			
Train			
Foot			
Cycle			

Powered Two-Wheeler (PTW)			
----------------------------------	--	--	--

Table 1 - Example table for displaying modal split targets

An explanation of how these targets have been developed should be included as well (i.e., a justification of these targets considering the site location and sustainable transport infrastructure in the area).

Action Plan

An Action Plan should be included in the appendix which details each measure to be conducted as part of the Travel Plan (including resources to be allocated to the TPC role). The action plan should be similar in layout to the example table below. A cost estimate for these items must be included which is used to approximate a Travel Plan Cash Deposit (see “Delivery and Enforcement”).

Objective	Action	Start Date	Due Date	Responsibility	Mode affected	Cost Estimate

Table 2 - Example Action Plan

Roles and Responsibilities

A commitment should be included for the TPC to establish a steering group to assist with the future development of the Travel Plan. This group should include key stakeholders such as: the occupying companies, local public transport operators and cycle shops, and other local developments.

Monitoring

A minimum 35% response rate must be attained in order for travel questionnaire surveys to be considered statistically significant. If this cannot be achieved, then discussions should be had with HCC regarding carrying out TRICS SAM or ATC surveys.

There are currently no measures in place to encourage members of staff to complete a questionnaire survey. Entry into a prize draw could be offered to those who complete a survey, although it should be noted that the prize should not be travel-related (e.g., bus tickets, cycle vouchers, etc).

A sample questionnaire survey should be provided in the appendices. [An example residential questionnaire survey has been attached which could also be adapted to serve a commercial site.]

Delivery and Enforcement

There should be a reference in the document to a means for enforcing the FTP. Typically, this is accomplished through a Section 106 agreement, not a Planning Condition as suggested in Section 4.6.

Sanctions should be in place in the event that the commitments stated in the FTP are not met. This includes any remedial measures which could be implemented if the targets are not met, e.g., personalised transport planning.

Recommendation

The Highway Authority require the following additional information to address a number of concerns with the application:

- A WCHAR auditing walking and cycling routes available to the site;
 - Up-to-date accident data from Hampshire Constabulary;
 - Further information regarding the proposed barrier/flow restriction system;
 - Updated tracking and an RSA for the internal site layout;
 - Provision of a continuous route for cyclists from Langstone Road to Footpath 51;
 - Clarification regarding the proposed trip generation;
 - Junction modelling for the Harts Farm Way/Brockhampton Road Roundabout (discussions with the Highway Authority required before any modelling takes place);
- and
- Amendments to the Travel Plan.

Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre

Within 800m SSSI Langstone Harbour

Within 800m SPA Chichester and Langstone Harbours

Within 800m SAC Solent Maritime

Within 800m RAMSAR Chichester and Langstone Harbours

Within 50m Stream containing Notable and protected species European Water Vole

Health and Safety Executive

Further Comments

The proposed development site which you have identified does not currently lie within the consultation distance (CD) of a major hazard site or major accident hazard pipeline; therefore at present HSE does not need to be consulted on any developments on this site. However, should there be a delay submitting a planning application for the proposed development on this site, you may wish to approach HSE again to ensure that there have been no changes to CDs in this area in the intervening period.

This advice report has been generated using information supplied by Admin User at Havant District (B) on 18 November 2022.

Landscape Team, Havant Borough Council

Further Comments

From a landscape perspective we have the following comments in relation to this application:

- We welcome the changes to the landscape mitigation the applicant has taken on board all the comments raised previously.

Original Comments

From a landscape perspective we have no adverse comments in relation to this application.

Langstone Harbour Board

No comments received.

Local Lead Flood Authority HCC

Final Comments

We have reviewed the information provided and there does not appear to be any change to the surface water drainage since our previous response. The amendments appear to be in relation to fluvial aspects which the Environment Agency will comment on.

As such, we consider our previous response in which we stated no objection subject to condition to still be valid.

Original Comments

The County Council has reviewed the following documents relating to the above application:

- Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy Report; Project Ref: 13023; Report Ref: R102; dated: December 2021.

The information submitted by the applicant in support of this planning application indicates that surface water runoff from the application site will be managed through green roofs, permeable paving, and cellular attenuation tanks. Additionally, surface water will be discharged into the Southern Water's public surface water network (zone 1), into an existing on-site surface water sewer prior to discharging into Mill Stream through (zone 2), and into a private surface water network (zone 3A/B), at discharge rates of 214.1 l/s, 219.0 l/s and 132.0 l/s respectively.

The proposals are acceptable in principle since the underlying geology will make infiltration infeasible at the application site, considering that the proposals follow the existing drainage pattern, and bearing in mind the proposed betterment on the existing discharge rates.

The information submitted by the applicant has addressed our concerns regarding surface water management and local flood risk. Therefore, the County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority has **no objection** to the proposals subject to the following planning conditions:

1. No development shall begin until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the principles within the Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Drainage Strategy Report ref: 13023 / R102, has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should include:

- a. A technical summary highlighting any changes to the design from that within the approved Flood Risk Assessment.
- b. Detailed drainage layout drawings at an identified scale indicating catchment areas, referenced drainage features, manhole cover and invert levels and pipe diameters, lengths and gradients.
- c. Detailed hydraulic calculations for all rainfall events, including the listed below. The hydraulic calculations should take into account the connectivity of the entire drainage features including the discharge location. The results should include design and simulation criteria, network design and result tables, manholes schedule tables and

summary of critical result by maximum level during the 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 (plus an allowance for climate change) rainfall events. The drainage features should have the same reference that the submitted drainage layout.

d. Confirmation on how impacts of high groundwater will be managed in the design of the proposed drainage system to ensure that storage capacity is not lost, and structural integrity is maintained.

e. Confirmation that sufficient water quality measures have been included to satisfy the methodology in the Ciria SuDS Manual C753.

f. Exceedance plans demonstrating the flow paths and areas of ponding in the event of blockages or storms exceeding design criteria.

2. The condition of the existing sewers, which will take surface water from the development site, should be investigated before any connection is made. If necessary, improvement to their condition as reparation, remediation, restitution or replacement should be undertaken. Evidence of this, including photographs should be submitted. If necessary, evidence that the asset owners have agreed to the principle of connection/re-using existing connections and discharge rates, should be submitted before any connection is made.

3. Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings. The submitted details shall include;

a. Maintenance schedules for each drainage feature type and ownership

b. Details of protection measures.

Natural England

Final Comments

This advice should be taken as Natural England's formal representation on appropriate assessment given under regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). You are entitled to have regard to this representation.

With regard to European Sites, Natural England does not object to the granting of this permission subject to the advice given below.

Your appropriate assessment, dated 17 March 2022, concludes that your authority is able to ascertain that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the sites in question. Having considered the assessment, and the measures proposed to mitigate for all identified adverse effects that could potentially occur as a result of the proposal, Natural England advises that we concur with the assessment conclusions.

Construction impacts:

Natural England advise that best practice measures are adopted during construction to limit noise and visual disturbance to the adjacent sensitive habitat. Natural England advises that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the district ecologist that identifies the steps and procedures that will be implemented to avoid or mitigate constructional impacts on the adjacent Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA, Ramsar and the SPA's functional land mentioned above.

The CEMP should address the following impacts:

- Noise/visual/vibrational impacts
- Visual screening (for SPA birds)
- Storage of construction materials/chemicals and equipment;
- Dust suppression
- Chemical and/or fuel run-off from construction into designated sites
- Waste disposal.

In addition in order to mitigate adverse impacts through noise and make the development acceptable, we would recommend that the following planning condition is applied:

'Wherever possible, percussive piling or works with heavy machinery (i.e. plant resulting in a noise level in excess of 69dbAmax – measured at the sensitive receptor) should be avoided during the bird overwintering period (i.e. October to March inclusive). The sensitive receptor is the nearest point of the SPA or any SPA supporting habitat (e.g. high tide roosting site).

If such a condition is problematic to the applicant than Natural England will consider any implications of the proposals on the SPA bird interests on a case by case basis through our Discretionary Advice Service.

Provided the council, as competent authority, is satisfied that the submitted CEMP addresses the above impacts, then Natural England raises no further concerns.

This advice is provided on the basis that all mitigation measures will be secured as planning conditions or obligations by your authority to ensure their strict and timely implementation for the full duration of the development.

Open Space Society

No comments received.

Planning Policy

Policy Status:

The Local Plan (Core Strategy) and the Local Plan (Allocations), together with the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, provide the development plan for the borough.

Following the receipt of the Inspectors' Interim Findings, the Examination was concluded, and the Havant Borough Local Plan from Examination was formally withdrawn on the 16th March 2022. It is noted the Inspectors' Interim Findings report identifies that further work and assessment is required in relation to the impact of development on the A3023 corridor in transport terms which is also a material consideration.

The following Adopted Local Plan policies are of particular relevance:

- CS2 – Employment
- CS14 – Efficient Use of Resources
- CS16 – High Quality Design
- CS17 – Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas
- CS19 – Effective Provision of Infrastructure
- CS21 – Developer Requirements
- DM10 – Pollution

- DM14 – Car and Cycle Parking on Development (excluding residential)
- AL1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- AL2 – Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements

Principle of development:

The site lies within the urban area as defined by policies CS17 and AL2 in adopted local plan. There is therefore a presumption in favour of sustainable development subject to other considerations.

Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy seeks to accommodate flexibly a net total of 162,000 square metres of new employment floorspace between 2006 and 2026. The policy also prioritises the use of previously developed land for the provision of new employment floorspace. Policy DM2 seeks to safeguard existing employment sites from development proposals for non-employment uses.

The previous Havant Borough Local Plan identified Langstone Technology Park as a key project in providing commercial development, and allocated the site for about 12,575 sqm of employment development which reflects the extent permission. The proposed development, together with Phase 1 approved under APP/21/00405 would result in a total of 63,290 sqm. This would result in a small increase in the amount of floorspace overall (previously 58,412 sqm GEA prior to the B1000 demolition). It is considered that the development proposals would support the delivery of much needed new employment floorspace on site and is supported in principle accordingly.

Minerals and Waste:

The western part of the site is in the Minerals Safeguarding Area as defined by Policy 15 of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan, because it is likely to be underlain by sand and gravel. This is reinforced by the Minerals & Waste Safeguarding in Hampshire SPD which confirms that the LPA should consult Hampshire County Council as the total proposal area is over 3 hectares.

Heritage:

The development proposals would result in the phased demolition of existing buildings in order to facilitate the development of new employment buildings. As such, it is recommended the Council's Conservation Team are consulted in respect of the impact on any non-designated heritage assets accordingly.

Low carbon design:

Non-residential development over 500 sq. m is expected to meet the BREEAM 'Very Good' standard, unless shown to be financially or technically unviable in line with Policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy. In this respect, it is noted the submitted Design & Access Statement and Principles Statement indicates that a 'Excellent' BREEAM rating would be targeted.

Transport and Parking:

Whilst it is noted that the development proposals would result in a small increase in floorspace overall, the Council has prepared a Microsimulation model of the A3023 corridor to inform the previous Local Plan, and this can be used to model impact of the scale of any new development on the highway network, and inform any necessary infrastructure improvements.

The Inspectors' Interim Findings following the Examination on the HBLP identify that further work and assessment is required of the impact of development on the A3023 corridor in transport terms. The A3023 corridor is considered to constitute Hayling Island and north into Langstone up to and including the A27 roundabout. It should be noted that the summertime traffic impact of development constitute a material consideration and will be afforded weight in the planning balance accordingly.

Policy DM14 and the Havant Borough Parking SPD (July 2016) set out the parking standards for new non-residential development in the borough.

Summary:

The development proposals will deliver new high quality employment floorspace on previously developed land in a location which has been (previously) identified as a key employment hub. This is supported in principle.

Whilst the development proposals would result in a small increase in employment floorspace overall, it is, recommended that the summertime transport implications are addressed as part of the applicant's Transport Assessment, showing how a severe transport impact would be avoided, including during summer and weekend periods.

Ramblers Association

No comments received

SE Hants Clinical Commissioning Group

No comments received

Southern Electric plc, Network Investment Team

No comments received

Southern Gas Network

No comments received

Southern Gas Networks - stage 1

No comments received

Traffic Management, East Hampshire District Council

The Traffic Team have no adverse comment to make.

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: 54

Number of site notices: 2

Statutory advertisement: 18/03/2022

Number of representations received: 12 Objections including 1 from Havant Climate Alliance and Friends of the Earth and 1 from Langstone Residents Association (LRA)

Impact on Residents:

Buildings in Plot A near housing should be less than 12m in height

Buildings being built in South West of Park have max height of 11.7m

Plot B has reduced maximum height of 12m should be applicable to Plot A

Sections show trees on bank next to Langbrook Close and Brookmead Way - majority deciduous offering no protection most of year from sight & noise of buildings on plot A.

Replant with tall evergreen trees

Plot A building should not be for use that involves HGVs or use not normal office hours

Plot A buildings should not have waste bins/noisy apparatus or unsociable activities on east side

Plot A highest development in spite of being nearest to local housing

Would tower above bund built to protect residential areas from pollution i.e. noise & light

Overlooked

Precedent for thoughtful low rise business development at Endeavour Business Park

Environmental enhancement should provide evergreen screening to eastern boundary

Light pollution has long been offensive to local residents

Noise levels should be carefully monitored as should out of normal office hours traffic movement

Concern sight lines should show bund not canopy height – solid building blocks light through trees

Warehouse / distribution centre is envisaged

Traffic

Parking

Noise

Lighting

Bumping and rumbling of vehicles

Not best site for such use in Havant - similar units in Dunsbury Park - better road access

Noise concerns without controls over hours of operation

Concerns re plot A –to be taken into account prior to next stage of planning process

Plot A height higher than existing floodlights which already intrude at night

Considerably higher bund built to protect residents from sights and sounds of LTP

Height considerably higher than Endeavour Park which backs onto the Mallards

Implies planting provides sufficient screening, not so from October to April – most trees deciduous. Plot A would be totally visible to the residential properties.

During construction of Plot B noise has been extremely intrusive

Open communication with developer & residents panel would be positive way forward

Currently redevelopment of west of site caused noise disruption, especially during pile driving phase. Like you to consider timings of work to 8-5 Monday to Friday.

Confirmation needed no construction traffic will enter site from A3023 & only from west

During construction phase acoustic fencing should be in place

Current trees would need to remain in place with management and replacement a stipulation in planning.

Consider planting evergreen trees - eastern side (near housing) to provide winter screening

Concern at height of screening shown

Height should be considered for lowering and possibly moving apex further west so slope minimises height of eastern side

Would road to eastern side of plot A remain

Plot A – could more clarity be provided on use

What constraints in place to ensure no noise for local residents at unsociable hours

Hours of work and days?

15.8m high building would be an eyesore to residents and dominate their houses

Plans need to consider 'sight line' to/from upstairs bedroom windows of houses
Needs to be a transition in height
Plot A building needs restriction - no HGVs use building & normal business hours
Residents should not be subjected to 24 hour a day noise
Landscaping mitigation does not address concerns of householders
15.8m wall in full view in winter
Plot A should be in harmony with industrial buildings – i.e. Endeavour Business Park
Plot A use to be defined – health and welfare of householders and children need protecting – normal working hours 09.00-18.00 should be mandatory
Existing trees deciduous – existing fir trees dying, proposed trees will take at least 10 years to reach 10m
6 months / year a 15.8m wall – like a prison wall
Ample space for buildings of 15.8m height in North and North-West areas
Planting should be established in current planting season – to speed screening
Out of scale with residential area of Langstone and should be rejected
Travel plan assumes 24 hr use of site. Strongly object to this
Plot A should be low noise and low light pollution
In summer residential windows open and children trying to sleep – concern over impact on quality of life
Quality of life for residents should not be diminished

Employment/Business

Where is the requirement for new office space
What is intended use and what are the restrictions – very open
Lack of consideration of post Covid working – other sites struggling to let space
LRA object to loss to community of parkland setting for a technology business replaced by industrial estate of unknown future activity.

Highway Matters

Traffic density already a problem
Reduction in parking – impact on local roads
Insufficient parking
Concern at increase in traffic along Eastern access road – due to variety of businesses
Confirmation that access road A3023 would not be used for heavy traffic but continuation of the traffic limits
Cycle path from Havant to LTP removal of barriers north of A27 underpass is potentially dangerous – cyclists speed increased – risk to pedestrians
Concern over road safety audit timing
Concern over travel plans in reduction in car use

Sustainability

Much made of inefficiency of current buildings – but little attention to inefficiency of demolition
Buildings could be upgraded
Lakeside example of successful refurbishment
Upgrade and re-use rather than demolish and start again
Heating and power proposals can work for existing buildings
Question environmental benefits – not fully costed
Assessment to understand actual carbon costs of new units over whole life
Retaining buildings Environmental savings should be contrasted with new buildings energy savings
Developer should carry out feasibility study of whether buildings can be refurbished
Carbon emissions from demolition and rebuilding, including vehicle movements much higher than keeping buildings and retrofitting
Old buildings can be made more sustainable – insulated, energy systems changed to

solar/heat pumps, rooms and equipment updated.
Transport can be made sustainable – biodiversity can be enhanced

Heritage/Built Form

Cannot argue against application in principle – necessary to challenge loss of original buildings designed by Arup Associates.

Heritage Statement extremely detailed explain logic for demolition.

The case for adaptation not developed

Project will span over many years and community may regret loss of iconic buildings and landscape.

Following COPP 26 many businesses demand sustainability in the work environment.

Arup Associates received award for one of the buildings - if retrofitted an iconic building of this standard could be in demand

Opportunity for HBC to implement its Climate Change and Environment Strategy by getting developers to re-examine their environmental calculations

Havant poorer following demolition of award winning Arup Associates buildings

Drainage/Flood Risk

Extremely concerned planning to discharge surface water to Mill Stream

Water level in stream has increased – no capacity for existing surface water drainage

Regularly floods footpath

Drains below water level – Southern Water confirm surface water drain outlets should not be below water level – problem for EA to resolve

Portsmouth Water confirm springs water volume not increased

Issue raised with EA by residents over last 10 years

Areas of Brookmead Way at risk of flooding – stronger and heavier downpours expected in future, higher sea levels, current excessively high level of stream - strongly object to any discharge into stream from Langstone Park

Council should not allow developments to increase flood risk to local residential properties

LTP should stop discharging into stream

Other Issues

More could be made of amenity value of site for use of general public

Local homes much more welcome use for parts of the site

Applicant owns western riverbank – some of which in need of repair and causing footpath to be waterlogged – could this be addressed.

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) Business Case
- (iii) Economic Benefits
- (iv) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- (v) Impact upon residential amenity
- (vi) Highway Matters
- (vii) Flood Risk/Drainage
- (viii) Heritage
- (ix) Habitats Regulations Assessment / Appropriate Assessment and Ecology
- (x) Sustainable design
- (xi) Other Environmental Impacts - contamination / air quality
- (xii) S106 requirements

(i) Principle of development

- 7.2 The application site is situated within an urban area as defined by policies CS17 and AL2 in the adopted Local Plan where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development subject to other detailed considerations as set out in this report. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also emphasises the need to support sustainable development.
- 7.3 Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy seeks to accommodate flexibly a net total of 162,000 square metres of new employment floorspace between 2006 and 2026. The policy also prioritises the use of previously developed land for the provision of new employment floorspace. Policy DM2 seeks to safeguard existing employment sites from development proposals for non-employment uses.
- 7.4 Whilst the previously emerging Havant Borough Local Plan was formerly withdrawn on the 16th March 2022 following the receipt of the Inspectors' Interim Findings it is noted that the emerging plan identified Langstone Technology Park (LTP) as a key project in providing commercial development, and allocated the site for about 12,575 sqm of employment development which reflects the existing permissions (planning permission APP/19/00703 as amended by APP/21/00405). The proposed development, together with Phase 1 approved under APP/21/00405 would result in a total floorspace of 63,290 sqm. This would result in a small increase in the amount of floorspace overall (previously 58,412 sqm GEA prior to the B1000 demolition).
- 7.5 The business case for the proposed development is considered further in (iv) below including the suitability of existing and proposed buildings to meet modern business requirements. It is considered that the development proposals would support the delivery of much needed flexible and modern new employment floorspace on site and is accordingly supported in principle.

(ii) Business case

- 7.6 The application has been submitted with a business case for the development based on the existing business park and the limitations of the buildings on site and the opportunities provided by re-development. These are considered below:

Existing Business Park

- 7.7 As set out in the Economic Benefits Statement:

The Site was developed by IBM in the 1970's to accommodate their UK manufacturing headquarters. Since IBM left, the Site has evolved into a technology park providing office, laboratory, logistics and manufacturing spaces. Today, the Park comprises approximately 40 acres of land and accommodates c.51,755 sqm gross of employment floor space. The Park represents the largest concentration of commercial floorspace in Havant Borough and is recognised as a key employment area.

- 7.8 The now withdrawn emerging Local Plan identified the site as Key Policy 6. This assessed the park and provided the following comments:

The Park is currently the largest concentration of commercial floorspace in the Borough. It is a key employment area for the Borough and its further growth would boost the Borough's prosperity through provision of new business employment.

Historically the Park has enjoyed an occupancy rate exceeding 90%, but this has fallen to two thirds in recent years due to emerging competition, dated facilities and lack of appeal to occupiers. Nonetheless, the Park boasts a number of key benefits including excellent power and internet connections as well as being well-placed close to Havant Town Centre, Havant Railway and Bus Stations and next to the A27.

The site would benefit from improvement of its access infrastructure to better connect it to Havant Town Centre and its public transport hubs. It also needs improvements to the supporting facilities on-site to make sure that the Technology Park can offer the facilities that businesses require. It is therefore critically important that development of the site creates a campus which can accommodate digital technology firms containing all the necessary services and facilities needed to drive its continuing success.

There is an opportunity for the site to accommodate new and innovative commercial models. Incubator units could be provided to offer accommodation for new and expanding businesses. Offices and industrial floorspace for digital technology firms, together with education accommodation and training facilities would also be suitable and could help promote the Park as the premier location for 4IR (the Fourth Industrial Revolution) economic development on the south coast.

7.9 The submitted Economic Benefits Statement states that, *Occupancy levels across the Park have significantly fallen over recent years. The Park has a current overall vacancy level of circa 40% (Lambert Smith Hampton 29/11/21).*

7.10 The existing building stock has been assessed and it is noted that the buildings have changed little externally since their construction and are consistent across the site with little variation apart from building 7000. The main on site buildings are assessed in the Economic Benefits Statement and in summary this concludes:

Building 1000 Prior to recent demolition of Bays 1 & 2 approximately 14,957sqm floorspace. Laboratory, warehouse, manufacturing and data centre uses. Floor plates are deep with little natural light making conversion / refurbishment difficult and uneconomical.

Building 4000 Approximately 3066sqm floorspace. Office, laboratory and café facilities. The building is low rise and positioned at the heart of the Park, because of this it is generally concealed by larger buildings surrounding it and lacks any form of presence or visibility from the wider Park.

Building 5000 Approximately 8919sqm floorspace. Office, laboratory, and data centre floor space.

Building 6000 One of the last buildings constructed in site and is the former IBM head office. Approximately 11892sqm floorspace over 3 floors. Accommodates significant quantum of office space – disproportionate to current market demands at this location.

Building 7000 Approximately 5017sqm floorspace over 3 floors. Currently occupied by single user with bespoke requirements. Building dated and in poor condition – as with other buildings on site approaching the end of its serviceable life.

The existing building stock is serviced by a central plant facility which is extremely inefficient and at the end of its serviceable life span being over 40 years old. The plant is poor performing with high running costs and costs for replacement are significant.

7.11 The Economic Benefits Statement then assesses vacancy rates in the buildings as set

out in the table below:

Building	Total NIA* sqft (sqm)	Total Vacant Floorspace sqft (sqm)	Vacancy Rate %	Current Occupied Floorspace sqft (sqm)
1000	99,992 (9,199)	57,468 (5,287)	57.5%	42,524 (3,912)
4000	15,342 (1,411)	9,889 (910)	64.5%	5,453 (502)
5000	96,681 (8,895)	30,148 (2,774)	31.2%	66,533 (6,121)
6000	128,690 (11,839)	70,489 (6,485)	54.8%	58,201 (5,354)
7000	54,027 (4,970)	0	0	54,027 (4,970)

Potential On-Site Employment Level (Current Development)

7.12 The Economic Benefits Statement concludes that based on the occupancy ratings above it is estimated that the total occupied level of floorspace, if fully operational, could support around 1,071 full time equivalent employees. This is however considered to be very optimistic given the reduction in occupied floorspace taking place over time and employment on site is likely to continue to reduce in the existing buildings. The statement goes on to state that: *Based on the physical state of the of the buildings and the current shift in working patterns this level of employment on-site is considered liberal. In 2017 the average daily attendance on-site, according to facilities management, was recorded at 1,450. This decreased to 1,175 in 2018 and 2019. This reduction corresponds with Seagate leaving the Site in 2018. In 2020 and 2021 daily average attendance dramatically reduced to around 200. Attendance figures over this period are impacted by COVID-19 guidance to work from home. Whilst this guidance recently has relaxed, data for the last few months (up to February 2022) reveals the daily total attendance at around 300 people, a decrease in footfall of around 74% compared to 2018/2019 levels.*

7.13 It is considered that with changing working patters since Covid 19 and flexible working this is likely to negatively impact the need for large office floorspace on site.

Market Review

7.14 As part of the assessment of the site and existing building stock the applicants have carried out a market review and the conclusions are set out in the Economic Benefits Statement. This looks to consider the ongoing suitability or otherwise of the existing buildings to meet business market needs. This would dictate the attractiveness of the existing site and building stock to future occupants. The main conclusions from this review are set out below:

- Park constructed late 1960's – early 1970's – Designed for IBM
- Buildings served by central plan facility – now over 40 years old and beyond economic replacement.
- Building fabric, windows and cladding installed during original construction – inefficient energy performance.
- Occupiers increasingly focused on Environmental and Governance credentials –

demand for Park limited in current condition. Energy performance Certificate ratings is E for some buildings and D for others. Government white paper indicates from 2030 commercial buildings being marketed require EPC of B or above.

- Marketing of buildings for last 3-4 years has generated little interest.
- Detailed assessment of buildings and marketing provided.
- Vacancy levels are confirmed by local agents to reflect reduced demand for office space in last 5 years.
- Post Covid 19 – growth in sectors such as Industrial & Logistics, Healthcare, Life Sciences, data centres and elements of the Technology, Media & Telecoms sector.
- Demand for quality, modern, flexible and energy efficient buildings.
- Parks location considered less attractive for office occupiers in region – competes with Portsmouth market. Location close to A3/A27 an advantage for rising demand across Industrial and Logistics sector.
- Redevelopment of site to provide best in class business space designed to latest standards and with sustainability and the environment part of the design process compelling.
- Local Agents confirm that in the immediate vicinity there are alternative options for office occupiers.

7.15 In conclusion in relation to the existing Park it is considered that the existing buildings designed for IBM in the 1960's-1970's are reaching the end of their period of use and are dated in terms of flexibility, design and energy efficiency. This has been reflected in declining building occupation in recent years. The existing site provides an overprovision of office floorspace which is not reflective of current demands particularly for industrial and logistics floorspace.

Redevelopment Opportunities

7.16 The proposals are for the development to deliver flexible and adaptable employment space within this key employment area. The aim of the development would be to seek to ensure that the site can operate efficiently in modern buildings to meet changing market needs, providing an opportunity to attract inward investment.

7.17 Based on the indicative Masterplan for the site (including the development approved under application APP/21/00405 currently under construction), the development would deliver up to 63,290 sqm GEA of floorspace of which 62,781 sqm would be employment floorspace alongside 509 sqm of ancillary uses (such as Café and Gym). The floorspace would be provided in a variety of differently sized units creating a choice for potential occupiers in a range of industries provided by the flexible use types applied for. The Economics Benefits Statement concludes that: *The proposed floorspace could provide location options to a multitude of occupiers, including the existing local businesses on-site looking to expand or SMEs looking to relocate to the area.*

Employment

7.18 An assessment has been provided in the Economic Benefits Statement of existing potential and future employment opportunity at the site.

7.19 Based on occupancy ratings shown in the table in 7.44, it is estimated that the total level of floorspace, if fully operational, could support around **1,071** full time equivalent jobs as set out in 7.45.

7.20 The Economic Benefits Statement states that: *The number of jobs supported on-site once the Development is operational is calculated using job/floorspace densities set out in the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Employment Density Guide, 3rd Edition (2015). 60,290 sqm of the proposed floorspace has been assessed using an FTE/sqm range of 36 to 95 sqm per FTE. This reflects flexible use options across the site offering E Class (g)(ii) (research and development) and E Class (g)(iii) (industrial process) along with B2 (general industrial) & B8 (storage and distribution) use classes. The remaining 3,000 sqm has been assessed based on 12 sqm per FTE, based on an office related employment density.*

7.21 The Economic Benefits Statement states that: *It is estimated that the indicative Masterplan Development could support between 837 and 1,793 gross FTE on-site jobs, depending on the proposed use.* In considering employment on site, it needs to be taken into account that the current level of occupancy at the site is probably unsustainable going forward given the limitations of the existing built form outlined above. Overall, it is considered that the phased redevelopment of the site should ensure ongoing and sustainable employment provision at the site which is critical to the Council's aspirations at this key employment site.

(iii) Economic Benefits

7.22 The Economic Benefits Statement sets out the potential economic benefits from the proposed re-development of the site. These can be summarised as an overview as:

- Construction Jobs over a 10 year period – Direct 120, Indirect 117
- Construction Gross Value Added - £123m over construction period of 10 years
- Flexible Employment Opportunities – between 837 and 1,793 (direct jobs dependant on the range of uses)
- Gross Value Added - £44.4m to £133.7m per annum
- Supply Chain – Supporting 1,088 to 2,332 indirect jobs
- Supply Chain – Approximately £57.4m to £123.0m in Gross Value Added per annum
- Business Rates - £1.7m to £3.1m per annum.

(iv) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

7.23 LTP is a large 'campus style' industrial site which is relatively 'self contained' in character. The site is located to the south of the A27 dual carriageway which is partly elevated above LTP and south west of Langstone Roundabout and the west bound slip road onto the A27 from Langstone Road and Havant. Footpath 50 runs along the sites northern boundary. To the east are the relatively recent developments of the Premier Inn Hotel and Langbrook Farm Public House/Restaurant. Residential properties in Langbrook Close and Brookmead Way are also to the east and south-east of the site. The Langbrook stream and footpath 51 run to the eastern side of the site.

7.24 To the south and west of the site are business developments including to the South, Endeavour Business Park, Penner Road (Luxor Park, Pyramid Park, Alexander Park) and to the West Southmoor Lane Industrial Estate and industrial units in Brookside Road.

7.25 The existing buildings on the site include an element of uniformity which although

varying in heights have a considerable degree of continuity of material finishes with grey cladding and flat roofed designs. The buildings generally have a horizontal emphasis with banding and glazing adding to this emphasis. The buildings also generally have extensive footprints. The design of the buildings in the main reflect the IBM business requirements from the early development of the site.

- 7.26 To the south-west part of the site development is taking place under planning permission APP/21/00405 for new flexible use industrial buildings.
- 7.27 The current proposal would result in the phased demolition of existing buildings and the erection of new flexible use employment floorspace and associated works. It is important to note that this is an outline application with all matters reserved excepting access, this means that if outline planning permission is granted there will be a Reserved Matters stage where for example the detailed designs of the proposed buildings would be considered. Notwithstanding this, the application is accompanied by a suite of information seeking to set the parameters for the future development and these need to be considered at outline stage to assess the likely impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area and to provide a framework for conditions to guide future Reserved Matters submissions if consent is granted.
- 7.28 The potential impacts on the character and appearance of the area would result from the following main elements of development:
- The new buildings proposed on the site;
 - The re-configuration of routes around the site;
 - Car parking alterations

The new buildings proposed on the site

- 7.29 It is important to emphasise that the outline application does not at this stage grant the detailed design of the proposed buildings which would be a matter for the reserved matters stage. Notwithstanding this the application is supported by a range of information which would set the parameters for the later detailed proposals. This includes the Design and Access Statement and Principles Document, an Indicative Master plan, Proposed Building Heights, Indicative Plots and floorspace.
- 7.30 The Design and Access Statement and Principles Document (D&AS&PD) is particularly important in setting out the type of development envisaged and provides the following main points in terms of the future development:

Vision

The following principles have been set to inform the vision for the park:

- *Deliver high quality modern flexible employment floor space for a range of uses (including research and development, technology and clean logistics)*
- *Consideration of current trends moving away from large scale office development due to COVID-19*
- *Deliver a range of building sizes to attract a broad range of users to enhance vitality*
- *Delivery of attractive high quality employment buildings with excellent sustainability credentials targeting BREEAM Excellent and EPC A+ ratings*

- *Deliver an integrated welcoming public realm, with amenity space, soft landscaping, lighting and improved connectivity along with biodiversity enhancements*
- *Improve site wide legibility / wayfinding*
- *Rationalisation of existing car parking provision and re-location of car parking adjacent to building entrances*
- *Creation of high quality work spaces*
- *Managed site access prioritising service access from Brookside Road*
- *Development of complimentary support services such as an amenity hub incorporating café, gymnasium & outdoor amenity space to facilitate occupier and community wellbeing*
- *Creation of a coherent park with a sense of place*

Height, mass and bulk

7.31 The (D&AS&PD) sets out the following in terms of Height and Massing (summary):

- *Existing buildings generally 9m to 15.6m in height – majority of buildings such as B1000, B4000 & B7000 are built on raised platforms elevating buildings above general topography.*
- *Site bordered on northern and eastern boundaries by extensive mature landscape buffers mitigating scale of existing buildings.*
- *Site would be developed with range of buildings of various sizes with largest of proportion and mass commensurate to that of existing buildings on site.*
- *Larger buildings set back from site boundaries to reduce scale and mass, mitigating impact on wider area.*
- *Max building heights – Plot A 15.8m
Plot B 12m
Plot C 15.8m*
- *Plot A (South-east part of the site)
Potential for development of larger single building of a scale/mass commensurate to the existing building stock*
- *Plot B (east part of the site)
Buildings in this area would have a maximum height of 12m*
- *Plot C (Northern Part of the Site)
Potential to develop buildings with a with a scale and mass that is commensurate with the existing buildings but separated by landscaping, car parking and service yards which will reduce the visual mass of development through the creation of space between the built form. It is anticipated that the development of Plot C will be phased and deliver a number of varying sized buildings.*

In summary it is stated that:

Proposed building heights range from 12m to 15.8m which is commensurate with the existing building accommodation and sympathetic to the surrounding context.

7.32 Site sections have been provided which set out a comparison between existing building heights and the indicative proposed building heights. These generally confirm

that the buildings proposed are commensurate with the taller existing main buildings.

- 7.33 The site is relatively self contained and set back from most public vantage points. The indicative master plan shows the northern most buildings (Plot C) set a minimum of 25m from the northern site boundary. There is a strong belt of mature trees to the side of the A27 and A27 slip road beyond the public footpath running beyond the site boundary. The indicative layout shows proposed buildings set side onto the boundary divided by yards and parking which is broken up with indicative landscaping. Much of the northern side of the site is currently dominated by the extensive B1000. Overall it is considered that the proposed buildings whilst likely to be taller than the closest existing building would, subject to appropriate details have an acceptable height, mass and bulk when viewed from the north and compared to existing buildings.
- 7.34 The north-eastern part of the development would be Plot B. This area is set closest to the four storey Premier Inn and the part two storey Langbrook Farm public house. The Plot B area is set well back from the Langstone Road frontage. The proposed buildings would have a maximum height of 12m in Plot B area. This would provide a transition between the existing development and the taller plot C units. The height, mass and bulk of the proposed units is considered acceptable.
- 7.35 The south-eastern part of the site is shown as Plot A. The indicative masterplan shows a building set a minimum of 45m from the eastern site boundary. There is a wide landscaping belt to the eastern side of the site with mature trees and a significant landscaped bank. There then runs the Langbrook stream with residential gardens and properties beyond. The maximum height of development in this area would be 15.8m. The detailed assessment of impacts on residential amenity is considered in part (iii) of this report, however, in terms of the character and appearance of the area the proposed building is considered to have an acceptable impact in terms of height, mass and bulk.
- 7.36 To the south of the site are industrial buildings off Penner Way and to the west are other industrial buildings and a small number of residential properties in Brookside Road. The indicative proposals and building heights are considered to have an acceptable visual impact from these directions in terms of height, mass and bulk.

Design and materials

- 7.37 The D&AS&PD and submitted plans indicate how the proposals could be laid out and the height, mass and floorspace of the development. The details would come forward for further consideration at the Reserved Matters stage.
- 7.38 The materials proposed would also be considered further at Reserved Matters stage, however, the D&AS&PD states that:

Materials will be selected from a neutral colour palette to ensure the buildings do not prematurely age in terms of appearance and create a consistency and sense of place across the site. The colours would be grey, silver and white.

A limited range of colours is proposed to ensure a consistent approach across the site and to create the sense of a family of buildings. The selected colours would contribute to providing a modern appearance and could be used in varying combinations to provide strong visual contrast and interest. The colours are reflective of those approved under planning consent ref: APP/21/00405.

- 7.39 Roofs are likely to consist of a combination of pitched and flat roofs with parapet

gutters which are a feature of the existing site. *Low pitched 5 degree trapezoidal metal cladding is proposed to pitched roof's to reduce massing and building height with grp/polycarbonate rooflights provided at 10% minimum. Areas of flat roof will incorporate green roofs to enhance biodiversity. All roofs will incorporate areas of PV cells.*

7.40 In terms of glazing, the following details are provided:

Office and entrance areas are to have a high quality appearance with a high percentage of glazing to those elevations to enhance natural light and provide natural surveillance as well as to provide legibility and visual interest.

Glazing to entrance areas will be full height, to office areas proposals incorporating the following variations are proposed:

- 1. Full height glazed curtain walling from ground floor to top floor ceiling height*
- 2. Floor to ceiling glazing on each floor with solid breaks*
- 3. Ground floor ribbon windows 1500-1800mm high, with floor to ceiling glazing to upper floors.*

Glazing is to consist of either frameless silicone jointed curtain walling with projections or aluminium framed capped curtain walling.

7.41 It is important that any Reserved Matters applications which are likely to come forward for different phases at different times are guided by an overall design concept and the parameters set out in the D&AS&PD are carried forward to guide the future development. A condition is therefore recommended to ensure that this is the case. Overall it is considered that the proposed materials can provide a high quality modern aesthetic to the development, and the design would work with the buildings previously approved under planning permission APP/21/00405. The consistent use of materials and design features can help to create a sense of place and coherent development going forward. This would help to create a development with continuity and would help to mirror the original sense of an overall 'campus' development which would reflect the original ethos for the existing development on the site whilst providing flexible, modern business development to meet the aspirations of modern occupiers.

(V) Impact upon residential amenity

7.42 The main impacts on residential amenity are considered to relate to the built form of the development, potential noise, fumes, lighting and traffic impacts. The nearest residential properties to the site are to the east in Langbrook Close and Brookmead Way and to the west in Brookside Road.

Built Form

7.43 As the application is in outline form, at this stage the design, fenestration, size, height, mass and bulk of buildings cannot be assessed in detail but would be subject to detailed consideration at the Reserved Matters stage. Nevertheless, the application is accompanied by information which sets the parameters of the proposed development. In this respect the Proposed Building Heights plan is relevant, this indicates that the buildings proposed over most of the site would have a maximum height of 15.8m. The siting of the buildings is not fixed at this stage but again a layout has been provided to indicate how buildings could be accommodated on the site.

- 7.44 The proposal has been assessed in terms of potential impacts on buildings in Brookmead Way and Langbrook Close. These properties are detached properties generally backing onto the site with the Langbrook Stream and an area of extensive landscaped banking with significant trees. The impact of a building of the maximum 15.8m height on these properties has been assessed in detail and sections showing the potential relationship have been provided. In addition, the existing landscaping and tree cover to the eastern side of the site has been assessed and additional tree planting has been shown.
- 7.45 The indicative layout shows the nearest unit (Plot A) set approximately 74m from the closest residential property (No.11 Langbrook Close). The other dwellings are set off approximately 102m. The set off combined with the existing bank and trees are considered to result in a significant and appropriate separation between the built form of the development and the nearest residential property. There is proposed to be additional planting of evergreen and other trees provided in an area where the existing planting is less substantial. To ensure that this is the case and to guide the future Reserved Matters stage, a condition is recommended to ensure that any unit in Plot A is set a minimum of 4m distance to the west of the adjacent road and that the additional landscaping is secured.
- 7.46 The closest residential property to the west is 47 Brookside Road which is set approximately 87m off the existing building 1000. It would be set approximately 76m from the position of the nearest building on the Indicative Master Plan. The maximum height of the proposed closest building would also be higher than the existing building. The indicative master plan shows parking, the internal road and proposed and existing landscaping between the dwelling and the nearest building. The flank wall of No.47 faces the site with only three small windows, nevertheless a light test has been carried out in accordance with the Council's Design Guide. This demonstrates that there would be no unacceptable impact on light. It is considered appropriate to condition the position of the nearest new industrial building to be a minimum of 75m from this dwelling to ensure that an acceptable relationship is achieved at the Reserved Matters stage.

Potential Noise/Fumes

- 7.47 The proposals are for the erection of new flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g)(i)-(iii)/B2/B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)). This range maximises business flexibility on this important site. The uses applied for are:

E(g) Uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to its amenity:

- E (g) (i) Offices to carry out any operational or administrative functions,
- E (g) (ii) Research and development of products or processes
- E (g) (iii) Industrial processes

B2 General Industrial – Use for industrial process other than one falling within class E (g) (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste)

B8 Storage or distribution – This class includes open air storage.

With ancillary uses:

- E(b) Sale of food and drink for consumption (mostly) on the premises
- E(d) Indoor sport, recreation or fitness (not involving motorised vehicles or firearms or use as a swimming pool or skating rink,)
- E(f) Creche, day nursery or day centre (not including a residential use)

7.48 With this range of potential uses it is important to consider whether there are conditions required to limit potential impacts on residential amenity and to guide the Reserved Matters stage. The application has been submitted with a Masterplan Noise Assessment and this has been assessed by Environmental Health.

7.49 The Noise Assessment predicts that there is likely to be an adverse impact on residential amenity during the day due to noise from fixed plant and general industrial activities unless noise control measures are included in the final design of the site. Environmental Health have stated:

At this stage as the end users are unknown it is difficult for the specific mitigation measures required for each unit to be designed. I recommend that the following planning conditions are appended to any permission you are minded to grant in line with the approval for development of the south western section of the site:

The conditions requested are shown in full in part 9 of this report and relate to:

- External sound from plant, machinery or equipment to be equal or lower than background sound level at nearest of most affected noise sensitive premises.
- No externally visible or audible plant, machinery or structures to be installed at the premises unless details of external appearance and acoustic and odour prevention performance have been approved by the Local Planning Authority.

7.50 In addition it is considered important to ensure that the design of the units are such that those in closest proximity to residential properties are designed to ensure that any loading bays are positioned on elevations facing away from the residential properties. A condition is therefore recommended to guide the Reserved Matters stage.

7.51 The proposal includes very significant demolition and this is likely to take place in phases over an extended period. It is therefore necessary to impose a Construction Environmental Management Plan (including demolition) to include details of control of noise and dust during the demolition and construction works.

Lighting

7.52 The Design and Access Statement confirms (amongst other matters) that:

Detailed external lighting proposals of each phase of development will form part of a future Reserved Matters Applications.

Fittings will be high efficiency with reflectors to control upward and obtrusive light onto neighbouring sites. The luminaires will have good light control and sharp cut-off angles to reduce light spillage. The luminaires proposed for this scheme will have 0% upward light ratio and be fitted with a glass front to reduce the visibility of the light source and glare.

Luminaires will be orientated towards the site, away from the boundary to make them

less obtrusive to any current or future neighbouring sites. Buildings will be positioned to screen sensitive neighbouring uses such as the residential properties to the east of the landscape buffer on the site boundary.

- 7.53 It is noted that concerns have previously been raised in relation to the site with regard to light spillage from the site toward residential properties. A lighting condition is recommended to ensure that the detailed lighting of the site is subject to consideration at the Reserved Matters stage and that light spillage is minimised and to ensure that ecological requirements are met (this aspect is considered further in (viii) below.

Traffic Impacts

- 7.54 Overall the number of vehicular movements to and from the site have been considered in detail as set out in (v) below. There would be no significant alteration to traffic generation at the site when compared to the existing development (including the consented development). HGV movements would be from Brookside Road and Langstone Road but with restrictions on such movements during the peak AM period from Langstone Road. Brookside Road is already used extensively by HGVs accessing the site and other industrial premises. Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable increases in vehicle noise from access to the site.
- 7.55 As set out in Paragraph 7.33 above, it is necessary to ensure that loading activity takes place away from residential properties and a condition is proposed to restrict the positioning of loading bays to building elevations away from residential properties.

(vi) Highway Matters

- 7.56 The main issues in relation to Highway Matters are:

- Planning History
- Proposed Development, Trip Generation, Junction Modelling and Phasing
- Barrier Control and Internal Site Layout
- Sustainable Transport Provision
- Travel Plan
- Parking

The development has been assessed in detail in consultation with Hampshire County Council, the Highway Authority.

Planning History

- 7.57 In terms of the recent planning history, planning permissions APP/19/00703 and APP/21/00405 secured Section 106 obligations and conditions. The S016 requirements included:

- Financial contributions to footpath improvements
- Signage to footpaths
- Financial contribution to bus infrastructure
- Langstone Road right turn works and signage
- Travel Plan

Conditions secured a Construction Traffic Management Plan and traffic barriers within

the site to restrict access from Langstone Road between 07:30-9:00am.

It should also be noted that the earlier planning history included the S52 Agreement from 1982 included restrictions in during peak AM hours to the site from Langstone Road.

Proposed Development, Trip Generation, Junction Modelling and Phasing

7.58 The development proposes the demolition of existing buildings (51,755m² floorspace) for replacement with 63,290m² of flexible employment floorspace.

7.59 The Transport Assessment sets out a summary of the total vehicle trip generation for the Proposed Development alongside that for the existing uses. For clarity B1 uses (now revoked) were:

B1 (a) Officer – Other than a use within Class A2 (i.e. not Financial and professional services)

B1 (b) Research and development of products or processes

Land Use	AM Peak			PM Peak			12-hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Existing uses	784	117	901	90	678	768	3048	3015	6063
Proposed Development (all B1b)	811	111	922	71	631	702	3030	3002	6032
Proposed Development (inc 3000m ² B1a)	817	112	928	72	640	712	3059	3029	6088

Table 5.3 – Proposed Development Traffic Generation

7.60 The Transport Assessment continues: *Table 5.3 indicates that the Proposed Development would result in a similar volume of vehicle movements as the Permitted uses including the 2019 Permission if implemented. Compared to the existing uses at the Site, the Proposed Development can be expected to result in relatively small changes in traffic generation. Table 5.4 provides a summary of the changes expected when compared to the existing uses.*

Land Use	AM Peak			PM Peak			12-hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Proposed Development (all B1b)	27	-6	21	-19	-47	-66	-18	-13	-31
Proposed Development (inc 3000m ² B1a)	33	-5	27	-18	-38	-56	11	14	25

Table 5.4 – Traffic Impact

7.61 It should be noted that Use Class B1 (a) and B1 (b) are now part of use class E(g)(i) and E(g) (ii) respectively, part of the use classes applied for. The Transport Assessment continues; *even the worst case scenario, including 3,000m² of B1a is forecast to result in a reduction in trips in the PM peak. The figures above for the proposed development are based on B1b trip rates, which are more onerous in terms of traffic generation than B1c/B2/B8. The actual traffic generation is therefore likely to be lower.*

7.62 The Highway Authority have considered the trip generation and state:

Two proposed development trip generation scenarios are presented: proposed development assuming all B1b land use and proposed development incorporating 3000m² of B1a office space. As the latter scenario presents a more robust trip assessment, the Highway Authority considers that these figures should be brought forward for consideration. A summary table is included below which sets out the different trip generation figures currently being considered.

Land Use	AM Peak (two-way)	PM Peak (two-way)
Existing Use (Pre-App Figure)	864	740
Existing Use (Current Figure)	901	768
Proposed Development (Assuming B1a) (now E(g)(i))	928	712

7.63 The Highway Authority confirm that: *Whilst there are restrictions in place to limit the level of vehicular traffic utilising the Langstone Road site access between 07:30 – 09:00 (therefore covering the AM peak hour), the trip increase within the AM peak hour would require junction modelling for the Harts Farm Way/Brockhampton Road Roundabout.*

This additional modelling has taken place and the Highways Authority have confirmed that: *The modelling demonstrates that the roundabout will continue to operate within capacity following occupation of the site. The modelling is therefore considered acceptable.*

7.64 Overall, it is concluded that traffic generation from the development would not be significantly increased as a result of the proposed re-development. Given this conclusion, and the likely reduction in weekend traffic from employment uses, it is not considered that the summertime traffic impacts being re-assessed as part of the Hayling Transport Assessment would be impacted by this development.

7.65 In relation to phasing the Highway Authority comment: *The applicant has set out a proposed phasing plan for the site within the TA, noting that it is their intention to demolish B6000 first to allow for the commencement of construction of the new access route through the site. The Highway Authority notes the potential flexibility in the phasing strategy and will require a Construction Traffic Management Plan which sets out a clear management strategy for the construction of the development once the applicant has set a strategy moving forward.*

Barrier Control and Internal Site Layout

7.66 Access to the site will be retained from both Harts Farm Way (via Brookside Road) and Langstone Road. Traffic control barriers are proposed in order to restrict access from the site from Langstone Road between 07.30 – 09.00 through an Automatic Number Plate Recognition system.

7.67 Each tenant will be allocated a number of vehicle registrations which will subsequently be allowed to pass through the ANPR barriers. The barriers will monitor usage and the level of vehicle usage will be adjusted where necessary to provide a stable daily figure. In the event that a vehicle which is not on the whitelist attempts to gain entry, a security guard will be stationed at the barriers whilst they are down who will instruct the vehicle to turn around when they enter the site to exit via the same set of barriers.

Anyone who regular attempts to gain entry when not whitelisted will no longer be able to gain entry to the site. The Highway Authority considers this arrangement to be suitable and will be secured via a suitably worded condition.

7.68 At the time of writing, the traffic management requirements in terms of access from Langstone Road are being finalised and members will be updated in relation to this matter.

7.69 The Highway Authority have considered the indicative internal layout and confirm:

Swept path drawings have been provided to show the movements of articulated vehicles at a 1:500 scale to allow for easier analysis of the track plots. The Highway Authority have reviewed the tracking drawings and note that the movements do not overhang the footways throughout the site. The tracking is therefore considered acceptable. It is also noted that the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit undertaken for the internal site layout did not pick up on any safety issues with the proposed layout, aside from the need to provide dropped kerb and tactile paving crossings within the development. It is considered that these matters can be incorporated into the final internal layout before the planning condition is signed off.

Sustainable Transport Provision

7.70 The applicant has undertaken a Walking, cycling and horse-riding assessment and Review (WCHAR) to audit the existing walking and cycling routes around the site to Havant rail station.

7.71 This assessment highlighted measures which could improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility to the site and these have been agreed as follows:

- *Widening of the existing footway on the northern side of the eastern access road to 3m to provide shared use facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. This will be coupled with a widened crossing point at the mouth of the junction with Langstone Road and the widening works to Footpath 51 which will provide a continuous route for cyclists heading from Hayling Island towards Havant.*
- *Wayfinding improvements around the site to direct pedestrians and cyclists towards key facilities. The full extent and location of the wayfinding will be addressed via a suitably worded condition.*
- *To meet LTN 1/20 standards, the existing railings by the A27 underpass will be raised to a minimum 1.5m in height. Similarly, the parapets over the existing bridge on the eastern access road into Langstone Technology Park will be raised to at least 1.5m given that this will now provide cycle connectivity between Footpath 51 and Langstone Road.*
- *To the north of the A27 underpass, the staggered barriers will be removed to improve cycle accessibility.*

7.72 These requirements would be secured via S106 Obligations / planning conditions.

7.73 In addition the Highway Authority require the following:

To ensure that the public have the necessary rights to pass along the private access road between Langbrook Farm and Langstone Technology Park, the applicant has agreed to the principle of wording within the Section 106 agreement which will grant pedestrians and cyclists with the rights to utilise the footway/cycleway in perpetuity. Through the provision of these rights and the wider cycle improvement works, a

continuous cycle route will be created between Havant and Hayling Island.

Travel Plan

- 7.74 The applicant has provided a Framework Travel Plan this seeks to provide initiatives to encourage site users to access the development via non car modes. A travel plan coordinator would implement the plan and control day to day management of the Travel Plan.
- 7.75 The Highway Authority confirm: *The approved Travel Plan will be secured through the Section 106 agreement, alongside the approval and monitoring fees and the cash deposit.*

Parking

- 7.76 The Indicative Masterplan has been considered in relation to parking having regard to the Council's Parking Standards SPD. The Parking Standards reference former use classes, however in the table below these have been updated with the latest equivalent use class:

Land Use	Car Parking Standard	Cycle standard (minimum)	
		Long stay	Short stay
B1 (a) office now E(g)(i) Offices to carry out any operational or administrative functions	1 space per 30 sqm Refer to note 1	1 stand per 150 sqm GEA note	1 stand per 500 sqm GEA
B1 (b) (c) high tech/light industry Now E(g)(ii) Research and development of products or processes and E(g)(iii) Industrial processes	1 space per 45 sqm	1 stand per 250 sqm GEA note	1 stand per 500 sqm GEA
B2 general industrial	1 space per 45 sqm	1 stand per 350 sqm GEA note	1 stand per 500 sqm GEA
B8 warehouse	1 space per 90 sqm	1 stand per 500 sqm GEA note	1 stand per 1000 sqm GEA

Notes 1. Subject to a condition or legal agreement restricting consent to the specified use.

- 7.77 The Transport Assessment states in relation to the proposed parking:

Car parking will generally be provided at a level of 1 space per 45m² of gross floor area for the employment uses. A limited area of employment floor space which is designed solely for use for B8 purposes will have car parking provided at 1 space per 90m² of gross floor area. Car parking for ancillary and support facilities will be provided at a maximum rate of 1 space per 14m² of gross floor area. This results in a total of 1,158 car parking spaces within the Site.

- 7.78 This is being checked against the submitted plans and numbered spaces have been requested for clarification. The quantum of parking is based on a flexible mix of potential uses. It is considered important to ensure that the parking proposed for each phase of the development would meet the Council's parking standards. With this application being in outline form where the layout and use of buildings is flexible it is difficult to conclude how much parking would be required at this stage. Parking would be further assessed at the Reserved Matters stage for each phase coming forward to ensure that appropriate provision is secured and a condition is recommended to guide appropriate provision going forward.

(vii) Flood Risk/Drainage

- 7.79 In relation to Flood Risk and Drainage, there are two main issues, Flood Risk / Surface Water Drainage and Foul Drainage.

Flood Risk / Surface Water Drainage

- 7.80 The site lies mainly within Flood Zone 1 (lowest flood risk), with a small part of the eastern periphery of the site within Flood Zones 2 and 3 – this is outside the area of built form in the indicative masterplan. A wider part of the site is within a future flood zone taking account of climate change. As the site is partly within a future flood zone taking into account climate change a Sequential and Exception test needs to be carried out and members will be updated in relation to this matter.

- 7.81 The application has been supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Outline Drainage Strategy Report. The proposals have been considered by the Environment Agency and Hampshire County Council as Local Lead Flood Authority.

- 7.82 The FRA states that the current drainage proposal is as follows:

For the purpose of this report an indicative drainage strategy had been produced to indicatively show how the surface water will be distributed off site.

In accordance with the approved Clancy FRA and SUDS Strategy the proposal for the masterplan development is to attenuate all surface water flows from impermeable areas to its current runoff rate. The indicative drainage strategy includes permeable paving which in addition to improving water quality by treating contaminants in the surface water run-off, it can also provide some of the storage requirement.

The size and location of the cellular storage tanks are indicative only and has been based on a total attenuation volume of 4877m³ The proposed attenuation storage requirement has been based on the existing 1 in 1 year runoff rate since the majority of the existing site consists primarily of hardstanding areas. Surface water discharging from the development will therefore be attenuated and controlled using a vortex flow control unit with a limiting discharge rate of 214.1l/s (zone 1), 219.0l/s (zone 2) and 132.0l/s (zone 3).

*..... it is proposed that surface water drainage from Zone 1 will be discharged to Southern Water's public surface water network, Zone 2 will be discharged to an existing on-site surface water sewer prior to discharging into Mill Stream and Zone 3 will be discharged to a private surface water network south of the development. Proposed discharge rates and methods are to be confirmed by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) / EA and Southern Water. An indicative drainage strategy can be found in Appendix B. *Note: The indicative drainage strategy is subject to detail design.*

- 7.83 The Environment Agency raise no objections to the proposals subject to a condition that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA and mitigation measures. This condition is recommended.
- 7.84 The Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) have confirmed that the proposals are acceptable in principle considering that the proposals follow the existing drainage pattern subject to the imposition of two drainage conditions, and these are recommended.
- 7.85 Subject to the detailed drainage scheme coming forward at Reserved Matters stages it is considered that an appropriate surface water drainage scheme can be secured for the proposed development.

Foul Drainage

- 7.86 In relation to foul drainage, the FRA states that:

....there is an existing Southern Water foul network that runs directly through and along the northern boundary of the site-wide development. it is believed that this existing foul drainage discharges to a sewer treatment works located approximately 200m west of the phase 1 western development boundary. The majority of the foul drainage serving the existing buildings located within the technology park is assumed to connect to the public foul sewer that runs through the park prior to discharging to the sewer treatment works.

The proposed foul network will discharge to the existing foul sewer that runs parallel to the unnamed access road through the centre of the site and will be connected, via gravity into existing foul manhole, referenced 3601, 2601 and 1600 as indicated on Southern Water's public sewer map.

It is anticipated that following the re-development of Langstone Park, the creation of new buildings following demolition of existing building units will result in an overall decrease in foul flows to the existing Southern Water foul network. The foul flow proposals for the entire development are therefore expected to improve the existing foul network capacity, however further contact with Southern Water will need to be made in order to obtain their approval.

- 7.87 Southern Water have requested a condition to protect their existing public sewers. They comment that: *The submitted details indicates the proposed development will result in a net reduction in flows discharged to the sewerage network. The proposed development does not cause any impact on the existing foul water network.* Conditions are requested and these are recommended.
- 7.88 Subject to conditions the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to foul drainage requirements.

(viii) Heritage

- 7.89 The application has been submitted with a Heritage Statement and a Consultation response has been provided by the Council's Heritage Team. In addition, the County Archaeologist has also provided a response to the proposals.
- 7.90 Whilst there are no Listed Buildings or locally listed buildings on the site, the existing campus style development has been assessed and is considered a non-designated heritage asset. The Heritage consultation response assesses the site as follows:

Langstone Technology Park consists of four main buildings of modular construction with minimalist landscaping linking around the buildings.

The site is a 'campus style' industrial park with buildings dating from the early 1970s. Originally built for IBM it housed one of two manufacturing plants in the UK. The smallest building was the first to be built on the site and appears in the In-house Arup Journal April 1971 the caption refers to the building being completed in 1970.

The buildings were designed and built by Arup with landscaping for the courtyard and grounds by James Russell. Design 39 Journal – VADS reports that 'the Financial Times award for industrial architecture 1972' was won by 'the new plant at Havant, Hampshire, designed by Arup Associates'. In terms of social history, the sites links with the development of the computing technology is of significance.

Building 6000 was put forward for statutory listing in 2019 however, it did not meet the requirements and was subsequently turned down for listing. However, the current buildings because of their design/construction provenance and social history significance are considered collectively as non-designated heritage assets. Whilst the existing building are quite plain by today's standards, they do represent an era of design and have by their association to Arup a certain level of standing in terms of design.

- 7.91 The proposal would result in the complete re-development of the site with the demolition of the existing buildings and the Heritage Team conclude:

As the proposal would result in the total loss of the buildings, it is considered that 'substantial harm' will result. As such, the proposal cannot be supported on heritage grounds. The wider benefits of the proposal would therefore have to be weighed up against this level of harm going forward in an application.

If it deemed necessary to approve the application, it is advised that a condition is included which requires a historic building record to be carried out prior to the demolition of the buildings.

- 7.92 As set out in this report the re-development of the Technology Park is considered to be necessary to enable modern business requirements to be accommodated at this key site for the economy and employment opportunities of the Borough. Notwithstanding this there is an associated loss of the non-designated heritage asset associated with the re-development. Given the comprehensive nature of the re-development, there is an opportunity to secure a high quality scheme which results in a quality design across the site and retains a sense of place for the development. It is recommended that this is achieved by a suitably worded conditions to ensure that the design and materials provides an element of continuity across the site and provides an attractive park for businesses to flourish.

7.93 In weighing the planning balance in relation to this development it is considered that the benefits associated with re-development in this case outweigh the loss of the non-designated heritage asset.

(ix) Habitats Regulations Assessment / Appropriate Assessment and Ecology

7.94 The Council has conducted a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), including Appropriate Assessment (AA), of the proposed development under Regulation 63 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The Council's assessment as competent Authority under those regulations is included in the case file. The screening under Regulation 63(1)(a) found that there was likely to be a significant effect on several Solent European Sites (as defined in the applications HRA) due to potential impacts on the water environment, degradation of supporting habitats, construction impacts and air quality.

7.95 The planning application was then subject to Appropriate Assessment under Regulation 63. This states:

The screening under stage 2 concludes that avoidance and mitigation measures are needed in order to ensure that there would be no likelihood of a significant effect to the above European sites.

The authority has concluded that any potential adverse effect from the proposal on off site SPA supporting habitat as identified in the Solent Waders and Brent Goose (SWBG) Strategy can be avoided by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

There is a likely significant effect in the absence of avoidance and mitigation measures from construction impacts and noise, disturbance and construction related pollutants. Avoidance and mitigation packages have been proposed which would remove this through a CEMP.

The potential impacts on the water environment and air quality can also be suitably addressed through the imposition of planning conditions and a S106 Legal Agreement.

7.96 The Appropriate Assessment concluded that the avoidance and mitigation packages are sufficient to remove the significant effects on European Sites which would otherwise have been likely to occur. The HRA was subject to consultation with Natural England as the appropriate nature conservation body under Regulation 63(3) who have confirmed that they agree with the findings of the assessment.

7.97 With regard to the on site impacts, the application has been accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment. The Council's Ecologist has considered the proposals stating:

In summary, I am satisfied that the potential ecological impacts are relatively limited. The main issues will arise during construction and during any pre-construction vegetation clearance. The outline mitigation measures are acceptable and should form the basis for a more detailed ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy.

I would suggest that his strategy includes firm details of all ecological avoidance/mitigation measures as well as full details of all proposed habitat creation and enhancement measures such as hedgerows and wildflower grassland. Details of any proposed green roof will be needed: these can be valuable enhancement features and could contain high-value ruderal habitat for invertebrates and bird species. I would

also expect the site to incorporate enhancement features such as bat and bird boxes. I would be especially keen to see nest boxes for Common Swift on the taller buildings. Details of site lighting will be required, demonstrating how seminatural habitats will be free from excess light spillage.

7.98 A pre-commencement condition is recommended to secure an Ecological Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement Strategy for each phase of the development.

(x) Sustainable design

7.99 The application has been submitted with a Sustainability and Energy Statement (SES) which outlines the sustainability strategy for the site. The NPPF sets out three overarching objectives to sustainable design:

- An economic objective which is explored in particular in part 7 (i) and (iv) of this report.
- A social objective which is explored in particular in part 7 (ii) and (vi) of this report.
- An environmental objective which is considered in part 7 (ii), (vii), (viii) and (ix). It is also necessary to further consider the requirements to use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution and mitigate and adapt to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy. These matters are considered further below.

7.100 In respect of efficiency the SES states that:

The existing buildings on site, many of which are hugely inefficient consume over 3.3 million kWh of gas and 18.7 million kWh of electricity each year, which together place the site's annual carbon footprint at over 4,500 tonnes of CO₂. The majority of floor space on site is EPC E rated, being poorly insulated and heated via out-of-date systems. The redevelopment proposals would move away from the existing centralised gas heating systems at the site, towards energy efficient, all electric heat pumps which are able to benefit from future national grid decarbonisation. Whilst at an early stage, following best practice benchmarks could potentially reduce emissions from the site by as much as 80% from existing site levels.

Given that the application is in outline form, it is considered appropriate to impose a condition on each Reserved Matters stage phase of the development for details of energy efficiency measures based on the SES to be submitted for approval.

7.101 In terms of resilience to climate change, the proposals respond to drainage requirements into the future including predicted more intense rainfall events.

7.102 Whilst the opportunities for improvements to the energy efficiency outlined in 7.100 above are recognised it is also important to consider the impact of demolition and construction activities. The SES states:

An audit has been undertaken of the existing site to explore what materials could be recovered and reused, helping to lower this impact. It is estimated that over 200,000 tonnes are theoretically able to be recoverable for use on site, or for projects in the locality, helping to reduce embodied carbon impacts. The reserved matters applications will follow design principles for waste management, building in layers and managing embodied carbon.

It is considered appropriate to impose a condition in relation to each phase of the development in relation to waste management to ensure that the principles of the SES are carried through; this would be part of a broader construction management condition.

7.103 In relation to the efficiency of buildings the SES states that:

There are currently no buildings constructed to BREEAM standards on the site and it is predicted that the existing buildings would perform no higher than 'Pass' if measured using BREEAM in Use criteria. The existing buildings are often of poor quality with limited levels of natural light, poor indoor air quality and ageing equipment and finishes. Redevelopment of the site enables opportunities for high design standards, including BREEAM Excellent and Wellbeing criteria, meeting policy aspirations and helping to attract new tenants to the site wishing to occupy low impact, high quality buildings.

A condition is recommended to ensure that the future buildings meet BREEAM excellent standards (this would have met emerging policy requirements in the Local Plan – now withdrawn).

7.104 The scheme would integrate measures to retain and enhance ecology and landscape buffers.

7.105 The development is well connected in terms of public transport and cycle and walking networks. The S106 agreement would secure a Travel Plan aiming to encourage the use of non-car based transport. The development would secure improvements to existing cycle/pedestrian routes. In addition, EV charging points are proposed, and a condition is recommended to secure this provision.

(xi) Other Environmental Impacts - contamination / air quality

Contamination

7.106 The application includes a Land Quality Assessment and the Council's Environmental Control Officer has proposed planning conditions for the following reasons:

1) To dismiss (or make acceptable-) the risk to controlled waters receptors, comprising the aquifers underlying the site and the local surface waters in the vicinity, in particular the 'Mill Stream' segment of the Lavant, and;

2) To dismiss (or make acceptable-) the risk to the development itself & the future occupants of the land.

Conditions are recommended to ensure that these matters are suitably addressed and if necessary mitigated. Subject to these conditions no objection is raised in relation to contamination issues.

Air Quality; Development as Source

7.107 The application includes an Air Quality Assessment and this has been assessed by the Environmental Control Officer who raises no objections to the principle of development, subject to the scheme seeking an appropriate degree of offset of development emissions. These would be secured by conditions for example in terms of barrier controls in peak hours to Langstone Road and EV charging points.

Air Quality; Emissions Offsetting

7.108 The Sustainability and Energy Statement, Planning Statement, Design Principles and Travel Plan set out the development's approach and the Environment Control Officer concludes: *The design principles, energy strategy, sustainability appraisal and transport strategy appear well-integrated, and in line with best practice. It is considered that this package of proposals will be capable of materially reducing the emissions associated with the site, including those associated with proposed buildings, with employee & customer travel, and associated with the contribution of the site to local power-demand. For these reasons, the proposals are supported on Air Quality Grounds.*

(xii) S106 requirements

7.109 The proposal results in requirements to secure S106 obligations in respect of the following matters:

- Prior to commencement of development, to enter into a Section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority for the improvement works to Footpath 51 and the cycle improvement works at the site access road junction with Langstone Road, as principally shown in drawing number 2010053-11 Rev B. To implement these works to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority prior to occupation of the development;
- Payment of the Travel Plan approval (£1,500) and monitoring (£15,000) fees prior to occupation of development; and
- Provision of a bond, or other form of financial surety, in respect of measures within the Travel Plan prior to occupation.
- Securing public access rights to pass along the private access road between Langbrook Farm and Langstone Technology Park (use of footway/cycleway in perpetuity).
- HBC S106 monitoring fees

8 Conclusion

8.1 In conclusion, the proposal is for the re-development of the long established Langstone Technology Park. The site is in the built up area where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Local Plan (Core Strategy) policies seek to allow further business development and to protect existing business sites. The previously emerging Local Plan (now withdrawn) identified the site as a key project in providing commercial development. The site is considered critical to providing industrial floorspace in Havant Borough.

8.2 A detailed case has been presented in relation to the limitations for modern business of the existing buildings both in terms of their design and sustainability. It is noted that occupation of the buildings has reduced over time. The business case has been made by the development team setting out the benefits of the proposed development. The development will allow for sustainable design including energy provision. There is now a proposal to replace the existing buildings with much needed flexible modern buildings at the site resulting in new employment floorspace. The proposals are supported in looking to secure the future of business and employment at the site.

- 8.3 The application is in outline form with access only to be determined at this stage. Other matters would be subject to a Reserved Matters stage and development is likely to come forward in phases. Nevertheless, the application has been supported by indicative plans and detailed technical information. The potential impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area has been considered at this outline stage and subject to appropriate conditions to guide the Reserved Matters stage is considered acceptable.
- 8.4 In terms of the impact on residential amenity, detailed consideration has been given to the potential relationship of the development on existing residential properties to the south- east and north-west of the site. This has resulted in the recommended imposition of a number of conditions which would ensure an acceptable relationship is achieved as set out in part 7 of this report.
- 8.5 Highway matters have been considered in detail with Hampshire County Council the Highways Authority. In this regard barriers are proposed to ensure that access to the site is restricted from Langstone Road during the morning peak period. Improvements to footpath networks and Travel Plan requirements would be secured by S106 legal agreement requirements. Parking has also been assessed and is considered acceptable in principle, however, the final Reserved Matters applications would need to ensure that each phase of development provides adequate parking provision to serve the final layout.
- 8.6 Flood risk has been considered at this outline stage and statutory consultees have raised no objections subject to detailed drainage conditions being imposed.
- 8.7 The proposals would result in the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset and this has been assessed in part 7. Overall, it is considered that in this case the loss is outweighed by the wider benefits of the scheme.
- 8.8 The proposal has been assessed in terms of impacts on the SPA and Protected Species and a Habitats Regulations Assessment / Appropriate Assessment has been carried out in consultation with Natural England. The proposal has also been assessed by the Council's Ecologist. Subject to appropriate conditions impacts can be avoided and suitably mitigated.
- 8.9 Other environmental impacts such as contamination and air quality have been assessed and subject to conditions can be appropriately addressed.
- 8.10 Following a detailed consideration of this important scheme it is considered that Planning Permission can be recommended as set out below.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION for application APP/22/00172 subject to:

- (A) The satisfactory completion of the S106 Agreement as set out in paragraph 7.109 above to secure the necessary requirements arising from this outline planning application (for which authority is given to the Head of Legal Services to complete the S106 Agreement); and
- (B) The following conditions (subject to such changes and/or additions that the Head of

Planning considers necessary to impose prior to the issuing of the decision).

Conditions:

Conditions to follow.

Appendices:

- (A) Location Plan
- (B) Indicative Master Plan
- (C) Indicative Plot Development Plan
- (D) Proposed Building Heights
- (E) Indicative Phasing Plan
- (F) Proposed Development Access Plan
- (G) Landscape Framework Strategy
- (H) Existing and Proposed Site Sections
- (I) Landscape Mitigation Sections
- (J) Landscape Mitigation Option
- (K) Indicative Drainage Strategy
- (L) Previous Consultation Responses