

Application Number: 15/10276 Outline Planning Permission

Site: Land Opposite CHEVRON BUSINESS PARK, LIME KILN LANE,
HOLBURY, FAWLEY

Development: 24 houses; office; open space (Outline Application with details
only of access and layout)

Applicant: LONDON & REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTS (DOLLIS HILL)
LIMITED

Target Date: 11/09/2015

1 REASON FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

Contrary to Parish Council View

2 DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND OTHER CONSTRAINTS

Built-up area

3 DEVELOPMENT PLAN, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Core Strategy

Objectives

1. Special qualities, local distinctiveness and a high quality living environment
3. Housing
4. Economy
6. Towns, villages and built environment quality

Policies

- CS1: Sustainable development principles
- CS2: Design quality
- CS3: Protecting and enhancing our special environment (Heritage and Nature Conservation)
- CS5: Safe and healthy communities
- CS7: Open spaces, sport and recreation
- CS10: The spatial strategy
- CS15: Affordable housing contribution requirements from developments
- CS17: Employment and economic development
- CS24: Transport considerations
- CS25: Developers contributions

Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Development Management Development Plan Document

- DM2: Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity
- DM3: Mitigation of impacts on European nature conservation sites
- HAR1: Land adjoining Hardley Industrial Estate

4 RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GOVERNMENT ADVICE

Section 38 Development Plan
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
National Planning Policy Framework

5 RELEVANT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE AND DOCUMENTS

SPD - Housing Design, Density and Character
SPD - Mitigation Strategy for European Sites
SPD - Parking Standards

6 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 6.1 67 dwellings, garages, 6 office/industrial buildings; associated highway works & open space (00/68900) - granted 15/5/01
- 6.2 Erection of 40 dwellings for affordable housing with some units including work related accommodation. Construction of access road to Lime Kiln Lane. Provision of Public Open Space (01/73687) - refused 14/3/02
- 6.3 3 buildings for B1 (Business Use) and B8 (storage or distribution) use (07/90281) - granted 13/9/07
- 6.4 3 buildings for B1 (Business Use) and B8 (storage or distribution) use (10/95910) - granted 4/11/10
- 6.5 1 three-storey block 70 bed care home (Use Class C2); 14 dwellings comprised terraces of 5, 4 and 3 houses; access; parking; landscaping (12/99387) - withdrawn 14/3/13

7 PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

Fawley Parish Council:- Recommend permission

8 COUNCILLOR COMMENTS

None

9 CONSULTEE COMMENTS

- 9.1 Hampshire County Council Highway Engineer: - Recommend refusal - plans do not adequately demonstrate that all vehicles can safely traverse the first section of the new access road.
- 9.2 Environment Agency:- No comment
- 9.3 Land Drainage:- No objection subject to conditions
- 9.4 Hampshire County Council (Education):- No objection - there are sufficient school places in the area, and therefore would not anticipate a need to expand local schools as a result of the development.
- 9.5 New Forest National Park Authority: - Proposal is unlikely to impact on the setting of the New Forest National Park; the proposal is, however, likely to have effects on the New Forest Special Protection Area, which will need to be mitigated.

- 9.6 Waste & Recycling Manager: - Properties require rear access; accessways must be constructed to an adoptable standard; hammerheads must be designed to enable safe turning by a refuse vehicle.
- 9.7 Environmental Health (contaminated land):- No objection subject to conditions.
- 9.8 Southern Gas Networks: - objects until the position of a pipeline in the vicinity of the development has been established and measures have been put in place to safeguard the security of this pipeline.
- 9.9 Tree Officer:- No objection subject to conditions
- 9.10 Policy - The site is the only employment allocation in this part of the district; residential development on this site would be contrary to development plan policy.
- 9.11 Cyclist Touring Club: - would like to see secure cycle storage for each home, covered visitor cycle storage, and a joint cyclepath and footpath between Lime Kiln Lane and Roman Road.
- 9.12 Southern Water: - No objection subject to conditions / informatives; advise that sewer might need to be diverted.
- 9.13 Hampshire County Council (Rights of Way):- No objection although advises that the definitive route is further north than the walked footpath route; therefore suggests informally rerouting the path onto the walked line or reinstating the path on the definitive line.
- 9.14 Ecologist: - Objects - insufficient evidence to demonstrate accordance with Policy CS3.
- 9.15 Environmental Design (Public Open Space):- Public Open Space (POS) should include play equipment; contributions are required towards maintenance of POS.
- 9.16 Development & Acquisitions Manager:- Supports
- 9.17 Environmental Health (pollution):- objects - existing adjacent industrial uses are likely to have a significant adverse impact on the proposed dwellings; an acoustic report should be submitted to address these concerns
- 9.18 Health & Safety Executive:- No objection
- 9.19 Environmental Design (Urban Design):- final views awaited - although it appears that a reasonable layout can be designed, have concerns with some of the proposed details.
- 9.20 Estates & Valuation: - it has not been demonstrated that there is no demand from potential industrial occupiers; considers that a marketing strategy should be agreed, and that the results be carefully monitored and submitted to the Council.

10 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

4 letters of objection / concern from local residents: - queries lack of shared ownership opportunities; additional office space is deemed to be unnecessary; concerns about pedestrian and cycle safety; highway safety concerns arising from additional traffic; concerns that Public Right of Way should be retained; concerns about maintenance of Public Open Space; drainage concerns; would like to see contributions made to allotments.

11 CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

See Assessment report below.

12 LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS

If this development is granted permission and the dwellings built, the Council will receive £27,648 in each of the following six years from the dwellings' completion, and as a result, a total of £165,888 in government grant under the New Homes Bonus will be received.

From the 6 April 2015 New Forest District Council began charging the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on new residential developments.

Based on the information provided at the time of this report this development has a CIL liability of £165,312.00.

Tables setting out all contributions are at the end of this report.

13 WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT/AGENT

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, New Forest District Council take a positive and proactive approach, seeking solutions to any problems arising in the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome.

This is achieved by

- Strongly encouraging those proposing development to use the very thorough pre application advice service the Council provides.
- Working together with applicants/agents to ensure planning applications are registered as expeditiously as possible.
- Advising agents/applicants early on in the processing of an application (through the release of a Parish Briefing Note) as to the key issues relevant to the application.
- Updating applicants/agents of issues that arise in the processing of their applications through the availability of comments received on the web or by direct contact when relevant.
- Working together with applicants/agents to closely manage the planning application process to allow an opportunity to negotiate and accept amendments on applications (particularly those that best support the Core Strategy Objectives) when this can be done without compromising government performance requirements.
- Advising applicants/agents as soon as possible as to concerns that cannot be dealt with during the processing of an application allowing for

- a timely withdrawal and re-submission or decision based on the scheme as originally submitted if this is what the applicant/agent requires.
- When necessary discussing with applicants/agents proposed conditions especially those that would restrict the use of commercial properties or land when this can be done without compromising government performance requirements.

In this case, there are significant in-principle objections to the proposed development, and therefore it would not be possible to negotiate on all of the concerns identified to secure an acceptable outcome.

14 ASSESSMENT

- 14.1 The application site is an undeveloped parcel of land which lies to the east side of Lime Kiln Lane. To the south side of the site are the residential properties of Harrier Green. The surroundings are otherwise largely industrial, with premises to the north, west and east of the site in employment use. There is a public footpath which crosses the northern side of the site, which separates the site from the employment premises beyond. A footpath also runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The site is now somewhat overgrown with rough vegetation. There is a line of mature trees along the northern edge of the site, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. There is also a group of protected trees on the site's eastern boundary.
- 14.2 There have been a number of planning applications affecting the site over the past 15 years. In 2001, planning permission was granted for 6 offices and industrial buildings, with a total floorspace of just over 2100 square metres. These offices / industrial units were granted under the same planning permission that was given for the residential development that has subsequently been built to the south of the site. Because the residential element of the scheme was implemented, the 2001 planning permission to build offices / industrial units on the application site remains extant. A subsequent 2002 application for 40 affordable dwellings on the site was refused as being contrary to policy.
- 14.3 In 2007, planning permission was granted for 3 office / industrial / storage buildings with a combined floorspace of just over 3700 square metres. This permission was renewed in 2010, but has now lapsed. More recently, an application to build a 3-storey 70 bedroom care home facility and 14 two-storey dwellings was withdrawn in March 2013.
- 14.4 The application that has now been submitted seeks to develop the application site with 24 dwellings and a single office building that would have a floorspace of 480 square metres. Based on the proposed footprint of the building, this level of accommodation could only be provided within a 3-storey building. Access to the development would be from Lime Kiln Lane. The development incorporates areas for vehicular parking, landscaping and public open space. The application has been submitted as an outline planning application. Both the access and the layout are matters for detailed consideration at this stage.
- 14.5 The application site is subject to a site specific policy within the Local Plan (Policy HAR1) which allocates the site for industrial, office and business development subject to a number of criteria. These include a

requirement for the existing trees and footpath along the northern boundary of the site to be retained and a requirement for a landscape buffer to be provided between the site and the adjacent dwellings to the south. There is also a more general requirement that the development be designed to minimise impact on residential amenities. The mainly residential development that is now proposed would be quite clearly contrary to this policy. The proposal would also be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS17, which seeks to retain all existing employment sites and allocations for employment use. As such, planning permission should be refused for this proposal unless there are material considerations to justify making a decision that would be a departure from policy.

- 14.6 The applicants recognise their proposal conflicts with Local Plan policy HAR1. However, they feel that their proposals are justified because there is no substantial demand for new employment development in the Holbury / Hardley area. In the absence of such a demand, they do not believe there is any likelihood that the site would be developed for employment purposes. They point to the fact that the site has remained empty for many years, thereby illustrating a lack of interest in developing the site for employment purposes. They also point to the presence of other properties in the local area, which would potentially be available for new employment developments. The applicants believe their proposals would be consistent with Paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which states that "Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose." This paragraph of the NPPF goes on to say that "Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits, having regard to the market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities."
- 14.7 To support their case, the applicants have submitted a Market and Financial Justification Report, which has been prepared by Gully Howard Chartered Surveyors. This report concludes that the possibility of developing this site for employment purposes does not exist due to the significant cost of development far outweighing the end capital value that could be reasonably demonstrated.
- 14.8 Although the application site has remained empty for many years, there have been previous applications to develop the site for employment purposes, indicating that there has been previous interest in developing this site for its allocated use. It is not clear why these previous permissions were not pursued. However, it is noteworthy that the industrial estate to the north and Chevron Business Park to the west of the site show very high levels of occupancy. The Council are also actively pursuing options for a large empty site at Unit 8 Hardley Industrial Estate, so that if this site is developed, and if the application site is developed for housing, there would then be no employment land availability in the locality.
- 14.9 There were no objections to the continued allocation of the application site as an employment site during the Local Plan Part 2's progress towards adoption. Given this is a recently adopted plan, and as this is the only employment allocation in this part of the district, it is felt that the

development of this site for predominantly residential purposes would be significantly harmful to the Council's economic and employment objectives for this part of the district. It is considered that the applicants have failed to make a compelling case for permitting a residential development on this site. In particular, the applicant's case lacks real weight due to a failure to demonstrate that the site has been appropriately marketed. Indeed, the applicant has not provided any evidence to show that there has been any recent marketing of the site for employment purposes. The Council's Senior Valuer notes that demand levels have been recovering recently, and therefore he considers that there would be sound expressions of interest in the application site if the land were to be appropriately marketed at a reasonable price. As such, taking all of these factors into consideration, it is felt that there is a reasonable prospect of the site being used for its allocated purpose, and accordingly, to resist the development of this site for residential purposes would not be inconsistent with national planning policies.

- 14.10 The applicants have suggested that they may be willing to provide a scheme that is a 100% affordable housing development, although they have not been absolutely categorical on this point, in that they have not confirmed a willingness to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement on this basis. The normal requirement on this site would be for 40% of the dwellings (10 in total) for affordable housing on site. However, even if the scheme were to be 100% affordable, it is not felt the benefits of additional affordable housing would outweigh the economic harm arising from the loss of a significant area of employment land that is the only allocated employment site in this part of the district, taking into account the lack of marketing. Furthermore, it is not felt that the office accommodation that is proposed as part of this scheme would be an adequate level of employment floorspace, given the whole site is allocated for employment purposes. Accordingly, it is felt the Council's policies should prevail.
- 14.11 There is a design logic to the broad layout that is proposed. Units 8-24 at the eastern end of the site would respond to the layout and form of dwellings to the south at Harrier Green. Units 3-7 would address both the new street and an area of public open space on the north side of the new road. Units 1-2 would provide appropriate interest at the entrance to the new development. However, whilst the layout works in broad terms, it does, as a whole, feel rather too intensive. The footprints of the dwellings are typically quite deep, resulting in negligible front garden spaces, and with the areas to the front of dwellings being dominated by large areas of parking. Rear garden sizes would be rather small (as little as 8-9 metres in the case of some dwellings), and the green areas that are indicated along the street and within the parking areas would not be sufficient to adequately soften the visual impact of this intensity of development. There is also concern with the scale of the proposed office building. The intended floorspace can only be achieved with a 3 storey building. A 3-storey building set so close to Lime Kiln Lane would appear rather intrusive and would also relate awkwardly to the likely 2-storey scale of the proposed residential dwellings. As such, it is not felt the layout proposed would deliver a scheme of a sufficiently high design quality. In essence, it is felt the development would feel too intensive and too hard edged, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

- 14.12 Based on the Council's recommended car parking standards, the office element of the proposed development should secure 16 on-site car parking spaces, whilst the residential element should secure 36 car parking spaces. The proposed scheme would secure only 10 on-site car parking spaces for the office element and 29 car parking spaces for the residential element. The level of proposed car parking would therefore be somewhat less than the council's recommended standards. However, the Highway Authority do not consider the shortfall in on-site parking provision would be detrimental to highway safety, having regard to national planning policy guidance that suggests that "local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is a clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network". Given the Highway Authority's conclusion on this matter, it is considered that the level of on-site parking would be acceptable.
- 14.13 The proposed development is one that would be expected to secure on-site cycle parking provision. The application proposes a cycle storage area for the offices, but does not specifically proposed any cycle parking in association with the dwellings. This lack of residential cycle parking would conflict with policy.
- 14.14 The Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed vehicular access onto Lime Kiln Lane would have adequate visibility. This access position reflects the access position that was approved for the 6 light industrial units that were granted in 2001. However, whilst the access would have adequate visibility, the Highway Authority is concerned that the horizontal alignment of the new access road may not be able to safely accommodate all vehicles, including fire appliances and refuse vehicles. The Highway Authority has objected to the application on this basis, but have indicated that this objection could potentially be addressed if the applicant were to provide a swept path analysis for this area.
- 14.15 The Ecologist has objected to the scheme. The ecology report that has been submitted with the application is a Phase 1 report that includes recommendations for a further survey of reptiles. In the absence of an appropriate and up to date reptile survey, the Ecologist is not satisfied that the development could take place without adversely affecting reptiles, which are protected species. As such, due to the potential adverse impact on reptiles, the proposal would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS3. It is likely that this objection could be addressed with further survey work, but in the absence of this further survey work, it would not be appropriate to grant planning permission.
- 14.16 The proposed development would relate acceptably to most adjacent dwellings to the south of the site. There are no main windows on the north side elevations of the adjacent dwellings at 25, 40 and 41 Harrier Green. Therefore, the development would not adversely affect the light, outlook or amenities of these adjacent dwellings. The dwellings at 21-24 Harrier Green would be set about 26-28 metres away from the rear elevations of plots 4-7. This would be an acceptable degree of separation and sufficient to maintain the reasonable privacy of these neighbouring dwellings. Units 1-2 would be side on to 16-19 Harrier Way at a distance of 12-15 metres. This would again be an acceptable degree of separation. The most affected neighbouring dwelling would be 20 Harrier Way, which would have its first floor rear windows about 22 metres away from the likely first

floor rear windows in Plot 3. A ground floor conservatory would be even closer, being only about 19 metres away. On balance, it is felt that this would be too close. Although the exact position of first floor windows is not known, there is a reasonable expectation that there would be first floor windows on the rear of unit 3 that would affect the privacy of the occupants of 20 Harrier Way to an unreasonable degree, given their proximity to the rear of this property.

- 14.17 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has expressed concern that residential dwellings are being sited closer to existing industrial units (with a B2 General Industrial use) to the north of the site and a builder's yard to the north and east of the site. These adjacent uses have the potential to generate noise that would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupants of the new dwellings. The application is not accompanied by a noise assessment. Due to the lack of such a noise assessment, there is reasonable doubt that the development could be provided without resulting in unsatisfactory living conditions, particularly for those dwellings closest to the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. On this basis, the proposal would not accord with Core Strategy Policy CS2.
- 14.18 The Tree Officer is satisfied that there is adequate separation between the protected trees on the northern and eastern boundaries of the site and the proposed dwellings. As such, the proposed dwellings could be provided without detriment to these protected trees. Any footpath works and street lighting along the northern side of the site could also take place without detriment to these trees subject to use of specialist constructions. As such, subject to appropriate conditions to ensure construction takes places in an appropriate manner, the development is one that would safeguard the important existing trees around the site's boundaries.
- 14.19 The proposed development could be provided without adversely affecting the route of the public footpath to the north side of the site. Whilst the aspect from this footpath would change, the footpath route would not be unduly enclosed by the new buildings and the route would, moreover, have adequate natural surveillance.
- 14.20 The application site is within the Fawley Major Hazard (middle) Consultation Zone. The Health and Safety Executive have not objected to the application and therefore, the proposed development would be consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS5 on this specific point.
- 14.21 Southern Gas networks advise that there is a gas pipeline in the vicinity of the proposed development (along the Lime Kiln Lane Frontage). In the absence of a detailed survey, they are concerned that the development could impact on the security of this pipeline, which could have implications for public safety. This objection may well be resolvable with further work, but as things stand, the development would not comply with Core Strategy Policy CS5 on this specific point.
- 14.22 In accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS7, the proposed development is one that would generate a requirement to secure 0.15 hectares of on-site public open space, including provision for children's play. The applicants are offering an area of 0.23 hectares of public open space. However, a significant part of this area of land should already have been provided as public open space under Planning permission 00/68900. This means that the completely new public open space that would now be

provided is actually less than current requirements. However, because the public open space that should have been secured previously was actually well in excess of what was required at that time, it is felt the level of public open space being provided now would be acceptable.

- 14.23 Whilst the applicants are proposing an adequate area of public open space, they have not secured it, or its future maintenance with appropriate maintenance contributions, through a completed Section 106 legal agreement. Nor have they secured any affordable housing through a completed Section 106 legal agreement. The proposal would therefore conflict with Core Strategy Policies CS7 and CS15.
- 14.24 In accordance with the Habitat Regulations 2010 an assessment has been carried out of the likely significant effects associated with the recreational impacts of additional residential development (as provided for in the Local Plan) on both the New Forest and the Solent European Nature Conservation Sites. It has been concluded that likely significant adverse effects cannot be ruled out without appropriate mitigation projects being secured. In the event that planning permission were to be granted for the proposed development, a condition would be required that would prevent the development from proceeding until the applicant has secured appropriate mitigation, either by agreeing to fund the Council's Mitigation Projects or otherwise by providing mitigation to an equivalent standard. In this case, if the applicants were to fund the Council's Mitigation Projects, they would need to secure a mitigation contribution of £99,100 (part of which could potentially be met through CIL payments).
- 14.25 Overall, the proposed development would not be consistent with the Council's local plan objectives and policies. Development of an allocated employment site for mainly residential purposes would be detrimental to the Council's economic and employment objectives. It is not felt that applicants have put forward an appropriate justification for the loss of this employment site, demonstrated by a lack of marketing. The scheme would also be of an unduly poor design quality, it would adversely affect a neighbouring dwelling, and it would be detrimental to ecological interests and highway safety. There is a likelihood that future occupants of the dwellings would be subject to undue noise disturbance. The development would fail to secure adequate cycle parking or appropriate provision towards public open space and affordable housing. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.
- 14.26 In coming to this recommendation, consideration has been given to the rights set out in Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions) of the European Convention on Human Rights. Whilst it is recognised that this recommendation, if agreed, may interfere with the rights and freedoms of the applicant to develop the land in the way proposed, the objections to the planning application are serious ones and cannot be overcome by the imposition of conditions. The public interest and the rights and freedoms of neighbouring property owners can only be safeguarded by the refusal of permission.

Section 106 Contributions Summary Table

Proposal:			
Type of Contribution	NFDC Policy Requirement	Developer Proposed Provision	Difference
Affordable Housing			
No. of Affordable dwellings	10		
Financial Contribution	0	0	0
Public Open Space			
On site provision by area	0.15		
Financial Contribution	0	0	0
Transport Infrastructure			
Financial Contribution	0	0	0
Habitats Mitigation			
Financial Contribution	£99,100		

CIL Summary Table

Description of Class	GIA New	GIA Existing	GIA Net Increase	CIL Liability
Dwelling houses	2066.4		2066.4	£165,312.00

15. RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would result in the unjustified loss of an allocated employment site, which would be detrimental to the provision of employment opportunities in the local area, and harmful to the economic well-being of the area, contrary to Policy CS17 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside the National Park and Policy HAR1 of the New Forest District Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management. Furthermore, it is not considered that the evidence provided in support of this application would justify a departure from policy.
2. The proposed development would be an unduly harsh and intensive development in this particular context, being characterised by inappropriately hard-edged and car dominated spaces to the front of dwellings that would have rather deep footprints. The development's intensive character would be further emphasised by some fairly small garden sizes and insufficient areas of greenery to soften the visual impact of the parking courtyards and new street. Furthermore, an office building of the floorspace proposed would, by necessity, be of a 3-storey scale that would

appear intrusive and discordant in this particular context. As such, the development would be an unsatisfactory design that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National Park.

3. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed development would not adversely affect protected species (reptiles) that could potentially be present on the site, and as such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National Park and policy DM2 of the Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management.
4. It has not been adequately demonstrated that the first section of the new access road would be able to safely accommodate all vehicles, due to the horizontal alignment of the access road at this point. As such, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development could be provided without detriment to the safety and convenience of users of the highway, and the proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to Policy CS24 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National Park.
5. Adequate provision is not made on the site for the parking of cycles and the proposed development would therefore fail to adequately promote sustainable modes of travel, contrary to Policies CS2 and CS24 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside the National Park and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Parking Standards'.
6. The proposed development would be likely to be detrimental to the amenities of a neighbouring dwelling and would potentially fail to secure appropriate levels of amenity for the occupants of the proposed development. Specifically, as a result of the proximity of the rear of unit 3 to 20 Harrier Green, it is probable that the development would result in undue overlooking of this neighbouring property, to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of this dwelling. Furthermore, in the absence of an appropriate noise assessment, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that occupants of the proposed development would enjoy satisfactory living conditions, due to the proximity of the proposed development to potential noise generating commercial units to the north and east of the site. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National Park.
7. It has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposed development could take place without adversely affecting a gas pipeline along the site's Lime Kiln Lane frontage, and the proposal would therefore potentially be detrimental to public safety, contrary to Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy for New Forest District outside of the National Park.
8. The proposed development would fail to secure an appropriate contribution toward addressing the substantial need for affordable housing in the District. The proposal would therefore conflict with an objective of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park 2009 and with the terms of Policies CS15 and CS25 of the Core Strategy.

9. The proposed development would fail to secure the provision of public open space on the site or make any contributions towards its future maintenance, which is considered necessary to meet the needs of the occupants of the development for public open space. The proposal would therefore be contrary to an objective of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District outside the National Park 2009 and with the terms of Policies CS7 and CS25 of the Core Strategy.

Notes for inclusion on certificate:

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, New Forest District Council takes a positive and proactive approach, seeking solutions to any problems arising in the handling of development proposals so as to achieve, whenever possible, a positive outcome by giving clear advice to applicants.

In this case, there are significant in-principle objections to the proposed development, and therefore it would not be possible to negotiate on all of the concerns identified to secure an acceptable outcome.

Further Information:

Major Team

Telephone: 023 8028 5345 (Option 1)



New Forest
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Tel: 023 8028 5000
www.newforest.gov.uk

Chris Elliott
Head of Planning & Transportation
New Forest District Council
Appletree Court
Lyndhurst
SO43 7PA

**Planning Development
Control Committee
September 2015**

Item No: 3c

Land opp.
Chevron Business Park
Lime Kiln Lane Fawley
15/10276
SU4204

Scale 1:1250

N.B. If printing this plan from
the internet, it will not be to
scale.



© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100026220