

Planning and Rights of Way Panel 1st November 2022
Planning Application Report of the Head of Green City & Infrastructure

Application address: 382 Winchester Road Southampton			
Proposed development: Re-development of the site to provide a four-storey 34 bedroom apart hotel including flexible cafe/function space, private gym/studio, secure cycle parking, eight associated on site car parking spaces, landscaping and space for public e-scooter/e-bike docking station (amended description).			
Application number:	22/00737/FUL	Application type:	FUL
Case officer:	Mathew Pidgeon	Public speaking time:	15 minutes
Last date for determination:	19.09.2022 (Extension of time 08.01.2022.	Ward:	Bassett
Reason for Panel Referral:	Five or more letters of objection have been received – officers not recommending refusal on all Planning grounds raised	Ward Councillors:	Cllr Harris Cllr Hannides Cllr Blackman
Applicant: Sabre Commercial Investments Ltd		Agent: Luken Beck	

Recommendation Summary	Refuse
-------------------------------	---------------

Community Infrastructure Levy Liable	Yes
---	------------

Appendix attached			
1	Development Plan Policies	2	Approved Plans: 07/01624/FUL
3	Compass House appeal decision		

Recommendation in Full
Refuse

01. Reason for Refusal - Parking

As a direct consequence of the location of the proposed hotel; which is outside of a City, Town, District or Local Centre and the Council's defined area of 'high accessibility'; and based on the information submitted, including the number of car parking spaces proposed on site, the number of bedrooms proposed and a parking stress survey, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the parking demand of the proposed development would not cause harm to the amenity of nearby residential neighbours through increased direct/indirect competition for existing on-street car parking, where high demand already exists, and/or be detrimental to the viability of the

Southampton Sports Centre following the expected loss of its car parking spaces within the nearby unrestricted car park. The development would, therefore, be contrary saved policy SDP1(i) of the amended City of Southampton Local Plan Review (2015), saved policy CS19 of the amended Southampton Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015), policy BAS 7 2. of the adopted Bassett Neighbourhood Plan (2016) and the relevant parts of the adopted Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011).

02. Reason for Refusal - Impact on Neighbours' Amenity

The proposed development by reason of its height, mass, bulk and depth of projection; and position of windows, within close proximity to the common boundary would have an overbearing and unduly dominant impact on existing residential amenity when viewed from Nirvana Place, leading to an overbearing sense of enclosure, unacceptable level of shade cast over the rear garden and a loss of privacy. The proposal would therefore harm the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, and demonstrates symptoms of an overdeveloped site. As such, the proposal would be contrary to saved policy SDP1(i), SDP7(v), SDP9(v) of the amended Southampton Local Plan Review (2015) as supported by paragraphs 2.2.1 to 2.2.2 of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (approved 2006).

03. Reason for Refusal - Quality of Residential Accommodation

Whilst the application seeks approval for an apart hotel use, and the Council recognises the transiency of such a use the proposed development would provide an unacceptable living environment for the future occupiers of the 4 apartments proposed for up to 6 month's occupancy. This 6 month maximum length of tenure for the self-contained serviced apartments would be more akin to a residential use class C3 and, owing to limited internal floorspace, fails to comply with Nationally Described Space Standards, offers limited external amenity space, and would provide a poor quality living environment for these long term residents and is symptomatic of a site overdevelopment. As such the development would be contrary to saved policy SDP1(i) of the amended Southampton Local Plan Review (2015) as supported by paragraphs 2.3.14 and 4.4.1 of the Council's approved Residential Design Guide SPD (2006).

04. Reason for refusal - Mitigation; S.106 Legal Agreement

In the absence of a completed S.106 Legal Agreement or Unilateral Undertaking the proposal fails to mitigate against its direct impacts and does not, therefore, satisfy the provisions of Policy CS25 (The Delivery of Infrastructure) of the Southampton Amended Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) as supported by the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended) in the following ways:-

a) Site specific transport works for highway improvements in the vicinity of the site which are directly necessary to make the scheme acceptable in highway terms - in accordance with policies CS18 & CS25 of the amended Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) and the adopted SPG relating to Planning Obligations (August 2005 as amended) - have not been secured;

b) In the absence of a mechanism for securing a (pre and post construction) highway condition survey it is unlikely that the development will make appropriate repairs to the

highway - caused during the construction phase - to the detriment of the visual appearance and usability of the local highway network;

c) In the absence of an alternative arrangement the lack of a financial contribution towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project (SDMP) and towards measures to reduce pressures from guests of the hotel visiting the New Forest SPA in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), SDP12 of the Amended Local Plan Review (2015), CS22 of the Amended Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) and the Planning Obligations SPD (2013) as supported by the current Habitats Regulations;

d) A Training & Employment Management Plan committing to adopting local labour and employment initiatives has not been secured in accordance with Policies CS24 & CS25 of the amended Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) and the adopted SPD relating to Planning Obligations (September 2013) and, as such, the scheme fails to deliver local targeted employment opportunities;

e) The submission and implementation of a Staff & Customer Travel Plan has not been secured to support strategic transport initiatives including those within the Local Transport Plan in an effort to promote and secure alternative transport modes to the private car;

f) In the absence of a use restriction clause for the apart hotel accommodation, with time limited occupations, the proposed self-contained nature of the development (where residents have access to all the necessary requirements to meet their day to day needs within their apartment) could be occupied akin to a residential use with wider implications that have not been fully assessed.

Background

This application for an apart-hotel has been amended since its initial validation but has, nevertheless, attracted significant local objection. Whilst officers agree that the scheme fails to comply fully with the Development Plan they disagree that all concerns raised – particularly around the building’s architecture’ and the potential loss of a family dwelling - merit a further refusal reason and so, on that basis, it is considered necessary to seek a Panel determination where all issues can be considered in the round and the Council’s full case established should the applicant chose to appeal a refusal or seek a resubmission.

1.0 The site and its context

1.1 The application site is located on the prominent corner of Winchester Road and Hill Lane with vehicular access achieved from Hill Lane. Informal car parking is available for approximately 9 vehicles. The site is occupied by 2 no.2 storey buildings one of which was originally a family dwelling house; both of which have most recently been in office use (use class C1). The site is located opposite, but outside of the defined Winchester Road Local Centre, which provide a range of uses and services for the local community. On street parking adjacent to the site is prevented by Traffic Regulation Order and the section of Hill Lane directly in front of the site forms part of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The site is located within an area of lower

accessibility in relation to Public Transport.

- 1.2 The wider surrounding area is largely residential, comprised of a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached houses although there are some larger flatted blocks to the north on Winchester Road, including the direct neighbour Nirvana Place which has three floors of accommodation. Southampton Common is less than 100m to the south, and Southampton Sports Centre is less than 500m to the north.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks permission for the redevelopment of the site to form a part three and part four storey apart hotel fronting onto Winchester Road and Hill Lane. An apart hotel functions in a similar way to a traditional hotel, but rooms are offered with their own cooking facilities meaning that they are, effectively, self-contained with the option of using the communal offer. Amended plans have been received since validation to increase on-site parking from three to eight spaces. This is achieved by ground floor amendments and the removal of the office. The amendments to increase the car parking offer were made in response to concerns relating to overspill car parking impacts and interested third parties have been re-notified.

- 2.2 The proposed building would accommodate 34 serviced apartments, a ground floor café which will be open to the public, a gym only available to guests, bin and cycle storage, associated back of house facilities for staff and a roof terrace on the third floor. The proposal would lead to some employment opportunities however the exact number is currently unknown. The proposal includes small landscaped areas facing Hill Lane and Winchester Road. As stated above an aparthotel comprises serviced apartments using a hotel-style booking system. It is similar to renting an apartment, but with no fixed contracts and occupants can "check out" whenever they wish, subject to the applicable minimum and maximum length of stay. An apart hotel room usually offers a complete fully fitted apartment with serviced laundry and cleaning. The Local Planning Authority normally seek a 3 month occupancy restriction on such Apart hotels to distinguish the C1 hotel use from a C3 dwellinghouse which requires different residential environment/amenity considerations. The applicants have suggested that 10% of the serviced apartments (4 units rounded up) are intended to be able to be occupied by the same guest for up to six months.

3.0 Relevant Planning Policy

- 3.1 The Development Plan for Southampton currently comprises the "saved" policies of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (as amended 2015) and the City of Southampton Core Strategy (as amended 2015) and the City Centre Action Plan (adopted 2015). Policies BAS1, BAS2, BAS3, BAS4, BAS5, BAS7, BAS9, BAS12, BAS13 and BAS14 of the Bassett Neighbourhood Development Plan (2016), as supported by the relevant guidance set out in the Residential Design Guide SPD (2006), are also

material to this case. The most relevant policies to these proposals are set out at **Appendix 2**.

3.2 Major developments are expected to meet high sustainable construction standards in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS20 and Local Plan “saved” Policy SDP13.

3.3 Paragraph 81 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the national policy approach for supporting economic development. This states that:-

Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

3.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in 2021. Paragraph 219 confirms that, where existing local policies are consistent with the NPPF, they can be afforded due weight in the decision-making process. The Council has reviewed the Development Plan to ensure that it is in compliance with the NPPF and are satisfied that the vast majority of policies accord with the aims of the NPPF and therefore retain their full material weight for decision making purposes, unless otherwise indicated.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

4.1 The most recent and relevant planning history for the site relates to permission for redevelopment by demolition and erection of a part two/part three-storey building (including basement car park) consisting of eight flats (three x one-bed and five x two-bed) on first and second floor levels and offices at ground floor level (reference 07/01624/FUL). It should also be noted that the permission was granted in 2007 under delegation. The length of time available to implement the permission was also extended in 2011 (reference 10/01514/TIME). The details of this application are set out in **Appendix 3** of this report for comparison.

5.0 Consultation Responses and Notification Representations

5.1 Following the receipt of the planning application a publicity exercise in line with department procedures was undertaken which included notifying adjoining and nearby landowners, placing a press advertisement 01/07/2022 and erecting a site notice 01/07/2022. At the time of writing the report **97 representations** (93 objections and 4 support) have been received from surrounding residents with objections from ward Cllr Blackman, ward Cllr Hannides, Cllr Fielker and the Old Bassett Residents Association. The following is a summary of the points raised:

OBJECTIONS

- 5.2 ***Use is not clear; not a traditional hotel neither separate residential units making application of policies and standards difficult to apply. Consider C3 residential use most relevant and therefore Bassett Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) policies should apply.***

Response

The applicant now proposes a maximum stay duration of three months for 90% of units and six months for 10% of units. As such 10% of the serviced apartments will be assessed as though they were residential units (use class C3) rather than a more transient form of hotel accommodation (use class C1).

- 5.3 ***Hotel use is contrary to Bassett Neighbourhood Plan policy BAS 1 which requires housing.***

Response

Policy BAS 1 does not prevent non-residential uses it instead encourages a range of dwellings, particularly family dwellings, in Bassett.

- 5.4 ***Contrary to paragraph 5.2 of the Bassett Neighbourhood Plan and policy CS16 of the Core Strategy as the scheme results in the loss of a former family dwelling.***

Response

Whilst one of the buildings on site was likely to have been capable of accommodating a family in the past the building does not currently contain bathrooms or kitchens necessary to facilitate use as a dwelling. Furthermore, reverting to a family dwelling house from the current office use would require separate approval and it is not certain whether this would be granted. As such there are no guarantees that the property would be available as a family home in the future, even if permission were sought. For these two reasons redevelopment in the form of an apart hotel is not considered contrary to policy CS16 or the Bassett Neighbourhood Plan.

- 5.5 ***No overarching policy need for an apart hotel. Other hotels available.***

Response

The NPPF defines hotels as a main town centre use and the application is supported by a sequential test and needs assessment to demonstrate that this site is appropriate (in principle). The Council's Planning Policy Team is satisfied that this submission demonstrates the potential need, targeted clientele, clear and logical reasoning for the identification of the site and has carried out an assessment of alternative sites to serve the identified need, of which there are none. Therefore the principle of hotel use in this edge of (local) centre location is supported. On this basis, the development should be assessed more broadly in relation to its design, amenity and transport impacts.

- 5.6 ***Impact of overspill parking***

- ***Contrary to Bassett Neighbourhood Plan policy BAS 7 and paragraph 13.6 as the scheme fails to achieve maximum off road parking numbers.***
- ***Most pressure on closest residential streets with unrestricted parking.***
- ***Harm to economic viability of retail units as customer parking will be further limited.***
- ***Reduced availability of parking linked to the sports centre & consequential impact on uptake of sports and recreation/health and wellbeing.***
- ***Reduced on street parking available for parents during school drop off and pick up times.***

Response

- Some concern shared by officers regarding parking pressure effects on neighbouring residents; this is discussed in the Planning Considerations section below.
- Reduced parking availability at the sports centre is also a concern, particularly when the sports facilities are in full use (particularly at the weekend when hotel demand tends to be higher).
- Harm to viability of commercial units' opposite is not a concern given that parking restrictions are in place including 'no waiting at any time' and restricted bays Mon – Sat 8am – 6pm 2 hours max (no return within 2 hours).
- Impact on reduced availability of parking for visitors to nearby schools (drop off and pick up times) is not a material consideration.

5.7 *Employment figures not included on application form which could affect parking.*

Response

The maximum parking levels set out in the parking standards SPD are based on floor area for hotels rather than staff numbers.

5.8 *Timing of parking survey doesn't account for sporting events or school drop off and pick up times.*

Response

Although guidance on how to perform parking surveys do not require them to account for sporting events and schools this would have been useful additional information to consider. Officers are fully aware of the existing parking demands in the area, and have visited the Sports Centre at the weekend when existing demand is at its highest. Nevertheless, the information provided is sufficient to allow the application to be determined and the Panel will note the proposed reason for refusal cited above around the impacts on existing parking supply from the proposals.

- 5.9 ***Traffic/congestion increase, including impact caused by customer drop offs and pickups, deliveries and refuse collection. Effecting emergency vehicle movement. BNP 13.7 recognises Winchester Road as having a high volume of traffic.***

Response

No objection received from the Council's Highway Engineers.

When compared to the existing office use the proposed apart hotel would not generate a significant increase in traffic or congestion at network peak hours and whilst there is a potential for some localised highway disruption caused by kerbside servicing, including taxi drop off and pick up; and deliveries, this would not cause a significantly harmful impact to other highway users. That said, the parking concerns arising from the scheme are noted and supported. Where necessary site-specific highway works could be delivered through the Section 106 legal agreement process. Refuse collection would likely occur at times of the day outside of peak traffic hours limiting impact and the Council's Highway Engineers have confirmed that refuse collection can take place from the public highway. These details would have been secured by condition in the event that permission could be supported and do not warrant a further reason for refusal

- 5.10 ***Highway's obstruction & safety during construction***

Response

Separate legislation would manage any temporary use of the public highway for construction purposes. Any temporary footway restrictions during construction would need to be authorised by the Council's Highway Engineers to ensure appropriate pedestrian safety. These details would have been secured by condition in the event that permission could be supported and do not warrant a further reason for refusal.

- 5.11 ***Potential for light reflection caused by bronze cladding having harmful impact on highway safety.***

Response

No objection raised by the Council's Highway Engineers. Specific details of materials proposed could be secured by condition.

- 5.12 ***Recognise good location for General Hospital and University of Southampton (U6 bus) however no direct bus route to the city centre or the train station along Hill Lane.***

Response

Although there are direct buses into and out of the city centre from Winchester Road, they do not follow the most direct route (Hill Lane); the site is also located in a low accessibility area. As such, officers agree that guests are more likely to be reliant upon their private car for their travel needs during their stay.

- 5.13 ***Insufficient cycle parking (1 for each unit required).***

Response

The Parking Standards SPD requires 1 secure cycle parking space to be provided for each residential unit. For hotels the standards are 1 space for each 10 employees and 1 space for each 10 bedrooms. The proposal seeks to provide 18 secure cycle parking spaces and whilst the exact number of staff is currently unknown this would seem reasonable when there are 4 (rounded up) residential units and 30 serviced apartments (hotel use).

5.14 ***Need for separate bins for separate uses.***

Response

The amended scheme relates to a hotel use and a café which would also be available to the public. Both are commercial uses and so there would not be the need for separate bin stores. Given the intended management of the residential units with longer stay duration separate refuse storage is not considered necessary.

5.15 ***Impact on neighbours; overlooking, including from roof terrace.***

Response

A privacy screen is proposed around the raised terrace; planning conditions can be used to prevent overlooking. Overlooking from serviced apartments is a potential consequence due to the position and size of the proposed windows and this forms a recommended reason for refusal.

5.16 ***Impact on neighbours; loss of light & increased shadowing.***

Response

The application has been supplemented with a Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report which confirms no significant loss of sunlight or daylight to any neighbouring habitable rooms because of the development. Reduced daylight reaching the garden serving Nirvana Place is, however, a consequence of the scheme and its relationship with its neighbours and is discussed further in the Planning Considerations section below.

5.17 ***Impact on neighbours; overbearing to neighbours and public realm.***

Response

Officers share the concern that at four storeys there would be an overbearing impact on neighbours. Whilst considerably larger than the existing buildings, it is considered that the streetscape can accommodate the 4-storey scale to bookend this prominent corner, but the subsequent impacts to residential amenity are less successful.

5.18 ***The position of building is forward of neighbouring building line effecting outlook from a bay window***

Response

Only a small section of the building would breach the 45-degree outlook line and given it relates to windows fronting the street the impact on neighbouring outlook is not considered significantly harmful. The 45 degree tool is purely

guidance and should not be applied strictly without a wider assessment of the circumstances.

5.19 ***Noise generation.***

Response

Provided that guests and construction workers behave reasonably the likely noise generated by the proposal would not be unreasonable. It is noted that conditions can be added to control hours of construction and plant equipment in the event that permission is supported, and the site would have on-site management to assist in controlling unneighbourly activity

5.20 ***Odour generation***

Response

Provided that refuse is kept in the dedicated store and collected frequently, there will not be any adverse odour and vermin problems. Furthermore, separate legislation can be used to control problems.

5.21 ***The position of the building is forward of neighbouring building line and therefore fails to respect the general layout of building along the street.***

Response

The existing building line is stepped between neighbouring properties; some variance is acceptable in urban design terms, particularly given this location on a corner fronting a wide junction.

5.22 ***Not in compliance with BNP paragraph 8.5 which states that developers are 'expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals'.***

Response

Paragraph 8.5 does not explicitly require public consultation or refusal of applications which have not taken local views into account. Officers recommend public engagement with the local community and it is up to the applicants how far they engage. The Planning Department has undertaken its own statutory consultation.

5.23 ***Contrary to Bassett Neighbourhood Plan in terms of height and appearance.***

Response

The Council's Urban Design Manager raises no objection to the proposed architectural design and scale of development which will bookend this prominent corner site. The BNP does not stipulate the height restrictions for this particular site.

5.24 ***Exceeds density set out in BNP 11.5 & 11.5.***

Response

The density guidelines are not relevant to most of the scheme, which is formed by hotel rooms (use class C1).

- 5.25 ***Visual impact of roof top plant equipment.***
Response
Given the scale of the building, height of the roof and scale of plant equipment it is not anticipated that visual harm will be caused. Planning conditions can be used to control the appearance of the plant equipment.
- 5.26 ***Overdevelopment.***
Response
Officers share concerns that a site overdevelopment of the site would occur given that the level of car parking provided, footprint to plot ratio, impact on neighbours and quality of the residential accommodation (C3 units) all lead to subsequent harm.
- 5.27 ***Harmful living environment due to air quality.***
Response
The proximity to a designated Air Quality Management Area can be mitigated by conditions including, for example, mechanical ventilation in the event that permission is supported.
- 5.28 ***Increased air pollution caused during construction and whilst the highway is obstructed; leading to more idling vehicles).***
Response
Separate legislation is used to control vehicle emissions, and a construction environment management condition could be added to control demolition and construction emissions; including dust suppression, during the demolition/construction phase.
- 5.29 ***Impact on sewers.***
Response
Southern Water raise no objection to the proposal and, as such, it is anticipated that an engineering solution could be achieved if permission is granted.
- 5.30 ***Impacting local drainage and contrary to BNP paragraph 20.2.***
Response
No objection received from Southern Water or SCC Flood Risk Management Team. A redevelopment of the site is expected to improve on-site drainage due to updated Building Regulations, the addition of planning conditions relating to sustainable urban drainage systems, soft landscaping and the possibility of permeable paving.
- 5.31 ***Proximity of building to neighbouring building and maintenance impacts.***
Response
This is a civil matter rather than a material planning consideration.

5.32 ***Poor sustainability.***

Response

The Council's Sustainable Development Officer has identified that the submission has not demonstrated what improvements are being made on current Building Regulations. If, however, the Panel are minded to support the proposal, then conditions could be added to secure further details prior to implementation.

5.33 ***Bat survey out of date by time of application decision and objection to loss of hedge supporting sparrows.***

Response

No objection is raised from the Council's Planning Ecologist subject to conditions requiring ecological mitigation and protection of nesting birds.

5.34 ***Nitrates, impact on protected habitats.***

Response

If the application is supported it would be the responsibility of the applicant to secure nitrate mitigation.

5.35 ***Needs of disabled users not adequately included.***

Response

All development has a duty to meet the needs of all users as required by the Equalities Act. Furthermore, the current Building Regulations will manage access arrangements including the needs of the disabled; a lift is also proposed which will allow access to the majority of apartments. An Equality Impact Assessment is not a requirement for the planning purposes although the decision is bound by the requirements of the Act and the scheme is deemed to be broadly compliant.

5.36 No details are provided of a fire assembly point.

Response

Separate legislation is used to manage fire risk.

5.37 ***No affordable housing element.***

Response

Not relevant/necessary for an apart hotel, and there is an insufficient number of residential units to trigger the need for affordable housing.

5.38 ***No employment and skills plan.***

Response

An employment and skills plan could be secured by s.106 legal agreement if the scheme is supported.

5.39 ***Maximum stay unenforceable.***

Response

The enforcement potential is no different to other hotel uses in the city; with any alleged breach of conditions or legal obligations thoroughly investigated

and assessed to see if it is expedient to take enforcement action where required. Whilst it is not normally necessary to restrict the term of a stay within a hotel the scheme offers guest apartments – with the full range of cooking and washing facilities that they might expect from a self contained flat. This makes the need for a restriction necessary.

5.40 *No details of opening hours for the café.*

Response

Opening hours can be controlled by planning condition.

5.41 ***Cllr Lorna Fielker, Cabinet Member Health, Adults and Leisure:
I object to this planning application on the grounds of adequacy of parking and its impact on the Outdoor Sports Centre.
The application states that the Outdoor Sports Centre car parking spaces can be utilised by arguing that these spaces are not required in the evening. The applicant has provided no evidence to support this statement.***

The facilities at the Sports Centre contribute to the We Can Be Active Strategy encouraging more people to take up exercise. The proposed improvements to the Sports Centre include 3 additional floodlit artificial grass pitches increasing usage of the facilities in the evening. The promotion of parking here by the applicant for guests to the hotel will place undue pressures on parking available for users of the centre which may discourage usage.

Response

Whilst Officer's share concerns about parking it is doubtful that the development would result in overspill parking negatively effecting the sports centre car park although cannot be discounted as a possibility which could occur on some occasions. This is discussed in more detail in the planning considerations section below.

5.42 ***Cllr Hannides – Panel referral if recommending approval.
This represents an overdevelopment and excessive density, it is not in keeping with the area and will have an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the neighbourhood.***

In the event you are minded to approve the application, I request it is deferred to the Planning Panel for determination. There is considerable public concern about this proposal.

Response

Officer's share concerns about overdevelopment and potential to effect character due to the scale of site coverage.

5.43 **Cllr Blackman**

Parking

In common with very many residents I am extremely concerned that the proposal for a 34 bedroom apart-hotel comes with only three parking spaces.

There are already heavy pressures on neighbouring streets, including Rockleigh Road, Highclere Road, Thornhill Road, Hill Lane, Pointout Road, and the service road on the Winchester Road roundabout. Placing additional demand for parking on these roads would cause considerable inconvenience to residents, as well as spread the problem to roads further afield, which also already have significant competition for parking places.

The picture painted in the transport plan accompanying the planning application is not one that I would recognise. The fact that there may be spaces in the sports centre at midnight is not really relevant; the overwhelming majority of residents need to be able to park easily during the day. The car park at the Sports Centre is very busy most evenings and at weekends, which often results in hazardous parking and prevents residents from accessing their driveways or parking close to their homes. There is also heavy demand for parking by parents of children at Hollybrook Infant and Junior Schools at the start and finish of the school day.

The transport plan also attempts to highlight sustainable transport options to the site, which again paints a rather distorted picture. People staying at a hotel are presumably going to be travelling to Southampton from outside the city. The only bus from Southampton Central train station to the site runs just five times a day, weekdays only. Hotel guests will likely use taxis or bring their own cars.

Paragraph 13.6 of the Bassett Neighbourhood Development Plan (BNDP) states that 'Where there is new development, re-development or change of use or intensity of a property, preference will be given to development that includes adequate provision for parking on site, as there will be a need for personal transport. When looking at development, any proposals must take account of the lack of service provision, particularly the inconvenience and random nature of public transport, and take account of the Council's maximum parking standards.'

It's clear that the plans proposed do not accord with the BNDP.

Traffic

The proposed site for the development lies at a very complex road junction that presents challenges and difficulties for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists alike. You only need to observe traffic movements at the two roundabouts to see how problematic the situation already is. The addition of a site with busy entrance and exit

requirements on Hill Lane so close to the roundabout will generate further complexity and additional hazard.

As Paragraph 13.7 of the BNDP states: 'Any new development feeding directly onto these routes should therefore take account of the high volume of traffic on these roads.'

Concluding remarks

In addition to the above concerns about parking and traffic flow, I don't believe that the plans offer any genuine form of sustainable development and should therefore be rejected.

Response

The concerns about parking are shared by officers. The Councils' Highways Engineers have compared the proposal with current use and do not object on highways safety or congestion grounds.

Comments in SUPPORT

- 5.44 ***Improves design.***
- 5.45 ***Will stimulate local economy based around the local centre.***
- 5.46 ***Will meet market demand particular from visiting university and hospital professionals and students.***

Consultation Responses

5.47

Consultee	Comments
Planning Policy	<p>The proposed development of an apart-hotel is considered to fall within Use Class C1. We consider short stay occupancy to be no more than 90 days. We would therefore request that the proposal is amended to a 90 day maximum occupancy so that it can be considered as a C1 use. If the applicant wishes to keep the proposal beyond this 90 day limit we would consider the development to represent residential (Use Class C3) occupation and would advise that the Council should be securing appropriate affordable housing contributions, ensuring appropriate amenity space, parking etc. in line with current residential design policies.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, and focusing on the proposed use as an 'apart-hotel', because the proposed development is over 750msq.m gross floorspace and not within an identified centre a sequential test is required and is noted to be included as part of the planning statement. The assessment clearly demonstrates the</p>

	<p>potential need, targeted clientele, clear and logical reasoning for the identification of the site and an assessment of alternative sites to serve the identified need, of which there are none. We are satisfied that the sequential test has been adequately conducted and we are in support of the edge of centre location proposed. In addition, we would like to note that the prominent location of this site offers the chance to create a new local landmark in the city, again which we are highly supportive subject to high quality design and support from the Council's Urban Design Manager.</p> <p>To clarify the position, should the applicant be amenable to the 90 day restriction, the Strategic Planning team is supportive of the proposed C1 development. Should the applicant not wish to have the 90 day restriction applied then the proposed use is considered to represent a C3 use and will need to be considered against all residential design policies, standards and contribution requirements.</p> <p><u>Response</u> <i>Since the above consultation response was received the applicant has agreed to limit the maximum 6 month occupation limitation to 10% of the units. The implications of which are discussed in the planning considerations section below.</i></p>
Housing	<p>The proposal is for an apart-hotel, but it is suggested lettings could be offered for up to a maximum of 6 months. A 6 month let seems more akin to a residential let and would not be consistent with what has been permitted on other similar schemes in the city. Unless a use restriction can be applied which Planning are happy an affordable housing contribution will be required under SCC Core Strategy policy CS15, in the form of an off-site commuted sum.</p> <p><u>Response</u> <i>Since the above consultation response was received the applicant has agreed to limit the maximum 6 month occupation limitation to 10% of the units. The implications of which are discussed in the planning considerations section below and it is noted that conditions could be used to restrict the occupancy of the hotel units.</i></p>
Urban Design Manager	<p>Support I think this looks really great, so from an aesthetic perspective I have no objection. I guess the only thing is whether there's too much white brick. There's certainly plenty of white used in the area on buildings so it is not</p>

	<p>out of character, but the building it's replacing is red brick. It maybe however that they've gone for white as it's a bigger building than the existing and therefore white as a light colour visually appears smaller than an equivalent sized building in a dark colour such as a red. Also as a corner building it does have the ability to landmark/bookend the existing streets in a manner which is different to those streets. Either way I think it is going to present a positive building addressing this spatial node.</p> <p>The first floor connection above the entrance to the parking area is acceptable in design terms; it needs to be in a different material to help emphasise the 'break' in the façade otherwise the building would read as a single piece which would be inappropriate.</p>
<p>Independent Design Advisory Panel</p>	<p>Commenting on a pre-application scheme the Panel made the following relevant observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Panel felt that there was a clear case of overdevelopment of the site and 3 storey to 3 and a half storey (interpreted as 3 storeys with a 4th in the roof space) would be more appropriate to this suburban context. • Pitched roofs and particularly the presence of gables is a key characteristic of this area and the flat roofed approach is at odds with this established form. • The previously approved scheme (07/01624/FUL) was the correct footprint and form; and if expressed using the excellent contemporary precedents shown in the submitted document would deliver an impressive and appropriate local landmark onto the roundabout. <p><u>Response</u> <i>The pre-application scheme had five floors of accommodation with the top being considerably smaller in footprint to the rest. The ground floor footprint was very similar to the currently proposed footprint.</i></p>
<p>Highways Engineer</p>	<p>No objection <u>Trip Generation</u> Office land use tend to generate more peak hour trips and therefore the proposal will likely result in fewer trips during network peak hours. The proposed apart hotel would behave slightly differently to general hotel use whereby occupants could stay for longer leading to less daily trips. However, if the purpose of the stay is for business, this may generate trips coinciding</p>

with network peak. The amended plan includes a gym linked with the hotel; this would not generate its own trips.

It is also noted that although informal, the hardstanding areas on site have been historically used for parking. Judging from historic photos, some likely reversing either directly onto or off of the highway occurred. Total number of spaces is difficult to determine but again, from photos, it would seem there have been times when up to 9 or 10 vehicles have been parked on site.

The proposal includes a slightly lower parking provision (8 spaces) and also formalises both the parking layout and on-site turning space providing some benefit to highway safety. The removal of office will also likely reduce trips generated during network peak hours. Considering these points, the level of trips and parking layout are considered acceptable.

Parking Pressure The transport information indicates that any potential overspill can be accommodated off site without the need for the Sports Centre Car Park.

Servicing The submission suggests that waste servicing (refuse collection) can and will be achieved from the kerb side. This is not opposed.

Other servicing requirements of the apart hotel are unknown. Until more information is received little conclusion can be drawn in terms of acceptability. It might be that servicing can take place from the kerbside however if there are large servicing requirements onsite may be more appropriate; if this is the case vehicle size would need to be restricted and a dedicated servicing parking space retained, or parking spaces required would need to be managed appropriately. Alternatively, a section of the highway could be used.

Waste collection from the kerb is considered acceptable as this is already an established movement based on the existing office uses – as well as a fairly standard arrangement in general.

Summary Overall, the proposed application is considered acceptable but the above issues regarding servicing need to be addressed.

Response

Whilst the exact servicing requirements have not been provided it is not anticipated that significant harm to the

	<p>highway would occur as a consequence. This is discussed in more detail in the planning considerations section below.</p>
Sustainability Flood Risk	<p>The Drainage Strategy proposes to manage the 100 year rainfall event plus 40% allowance for climate change, limiting flow to 5l/s through the provision of 30m³ of attenuation storage. Attenuation features outlined include rain gardens, geocellular attenuation tank and permeable paving. The use of above ground features such as rain gardens is a positive contribution to the site as provides attenuation for surface water as well as supporting biodiversity, water quality and amenity.</p> <p>If the case officer is minded to approve this application, it is recommended that sustainable drainage features as outlined within the Drainage Strategy are secured by condition.</p>
Environmental Health	<p>Environmental Health have concerns about and do not support the application. Although the area is a mixed residential and commercial location adjacent to a very busy road and roundabout, the dominant use of the immediately adjacent properties is residential and generally two - three storey properties.</p> <p>It is considered that the noise assessment which looks at the plant noise and indicates unlikely to be a detrimental effect on residents shows only a small part of the potential noise generation and environment. The greater concerns relate to noise emanating during use of the building; to include extraction systems from food areas, servicing and deliveries of foods etc and collection of refuse, noise emanating from functions and the general operation of the site.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some of this can be addressed by licensing conditions and controls, but there are concerns that the scale of the intended use is not suitable for this location so close to residential houses.</p> <p>Further information is required, or conditions will need to be applied, to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise levels from equipment, • Control of delivery hours, • Lighting locations and levels, • Refuse storage and collection • Hours of use of the office space and café • A demolition and construction management plan

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the ventilation of the property and if it will be mechanical or natural - with openable windows. <p><u>Response</u> <i>Whilst the amended ground floor plan indicates a 'flexible café/function space' the expected level of activity would not be high and conditions can be used to limit the noise impact of the development, on neighbouring residential occupiers including hours of use. As such officers do not recommend that these concerns manifest themselves as a further reason for refusal.</i></p>
Sustainability (Air Quality)	Concerns are raised around exposure due to the proximity to the Air Quality Management Area and dust however if minded to approve these issues could be assessed and addressed with the addition of planning conditions, including mechanical ventilation and sealed windows on the ground floor.
Sustainability	<p>We are not convinced that a robust investigation into potential sustainability measures that could be included in the development has been undertaken which indicates that sustainability is being considered early in the development process. There are also inconsistencies and errors with submission:</p> <p>Floorspace is 1541m² (not under 500m² as stated in the sustainability checklist).</p> <p>The sustainability checklist states that the development has not followed SCC Energy Guidance 2021-2025.</p> <p>The improvements on target emission rates set out are on building regs part L 2013 which has now been superseded by 2021. The applicant should demonstrate how improvements are being made on current building regulations.</p> <p>It is stated on p.14 that a communal ASHP will provide heating, cooling and hot water however it is than stated on p.11 it is a gas based system.</p> <p>It has not been adequately demonstrated why the roof layout does not lend itself to the installation of PV</p> <p><u>Response</u> <i>The applicant has been given the opportunity to respond to the points raised; at the date of writing the report a response has not been received. If minded to support the</i></p>

	<i>scheme conditions could be added to secure sustainability improvements.</i>
Ecology	<p>The application site consists of a building, an area of hardstanding, amenity grassland and a line of shrubs around the boundaries. An ecology report supporting the planning application confirmed that the existing building does not support any bat roosts.</p> <p>The boundary vegetation has the potential to support nesting birds so any vegetation removal will need to be timed to avoid the nesting season which runs from March to August inclusive.</p> <p>The proposed development will result in the loss of the existing vegetation which will have an adverse impact on local biodiversity. I would expect the new development to fully compensate for this loss and to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. The replacement vegetation should be of value to wildlife. Ideally it should comprise native species however, ornamental species of recognised value to wildlife are also acceptable. I would also expect to see more street frontage vegetation to maintain the green corridor around the corner of the street.</p> <p>No objection subject to recommended conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological Mitigation Statement (Pre-Commencement) • Protection of nesting birds (Performance)
Employment and Skills	An Employment and Skills Plan obligation will be required for this development and applied via the section 106 Agreement.
Land Contamination	No objection subject to a condition to secure a full land contamination assessment and any necessary remediation measures.
Trees & Open Spaces	Some loss of vegetation on site, hedging rather than trees but potentially valuable as habitat and as a pollution sink, at a busy junction with standing traffic. An impact assessment and potentially a tree protection plan would be needed for the street trees the conifer on Winchester Rd.
CIL Officer	The proposal is unlikely to be CIL liable provided that the rooms are let on a temporary basis akin to a hotel use.

Archaeology	No objection subject to conditions to secure archaeological investigation
Crime Prevention Design Advisor	No objection in principle.
Southern Water	No objection; apply recommended conditions and informatives.

6.0 Planning Consideration Key Issues

6.1 The key issues for consideration in the determination of this planning application are:

- The principle of development;
- Parking highways and transport;
- Design and effect on character;
- Neighbouring residential amenity
- Quality of accommodation;
- Air Quality and the Green Charter and;
- Mitigation of direct local impacts.

6.2 Principle of Development

6.2.1 The site is not safeguarded for a specific policy allocation and is located opposite, but not within, Winchester Road Local Centre as defined by Local Plan policy RE1 6 (Local centres).

6.2.2 The existing buildings on site accommodate office floor space and whilst policy CS7 (Safeguarding employment sites) of the Core Strategy safeguards existing employment uses it does not specifically require the retention of office floorspace in this location. Likewise, policy CS8 of the Core Strategy (Office location) does not specifically support office development outside of city, town or district centres so loss of the office accommodation is not opposed in principle.

6.2.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (NPPF) defines hotels as 'main town centre uses' and, as supported by Core Strategy policy CS3, applies a sequential approach that seeks to direct hotels to city, town or district centres if there are sites which are available, viable and suitable. The applicant has therefore undertaken a sequential assessment based on an agreed location criteria focused on proximity to both the University Hospital Southampton and the Highfield Campus - Southampton University. Officers are satisfied that the sequential test has been adequately conducted and no other alternative available sites within the area, which are more suited to the proposed hotel use, have been identified. The principle of the proposal has

also been supported by the Council's Planning Policy Team who have reviewed the sequential test.

- 6.2.4 The NPPF requires planning decisions to promote an effective use of available land. Development of the site has the potential to improve the site's appearance through building design & landscaping, increase flood mitigation by removing impermeable hard surfacing & incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems, improve site biodiversity, provide a location for community groups to gather and create employment opportunities.
- 6.2.5 Whilst the applicant has described the development as *sui generis* use the decision to seek 10% of the serviced apartments with a maximum stay duration exceeding three months is not considered to be a hotel use (use class C1) rather is more similar in character and impact to a residential use (use class C3). On this basis although the principle of residential in this location is not opposed the assessment will need to take account of residential standards for four of the serviced apartments (10% of 34 rounded up).
- 6.2.6 Accordingly, there are no reasons to oppose the development in principle.

6.3 Parking highways and transport:

- 6.3.1 Section 13 of the Bassett Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that Bassett experiences high volumes of traffic and parking pressure is an issue for the whole ward; partly due to the proximity to Southampton University Hospital and the recognised need for personal transport given that the area is relatively deprived of public transport; and development needs to take this into account when considering how many parking spaces are needed. Officers acknowledge that bus services into and out of the city centre do not follow direct routes and are also relatively infrequent and that the junction of Winchester Road and Hill Lane is restricted by traffic regulation orders limiting on street parking opportunities close to the site. Although the Development Plan seeks to promote more sustainable modes of travel such as public transport, walking and cycling the application does not sufficiently recognise that reliance on private vehicles is likely to be higher than normal owing to the characteristics listed above.
- 6.3.2 The planning application proposes eight parking spaces, which is 26 less than maximum parking standards allow: the maximum being one space for each bedroom. This standard takes account of staff requirements. To justify this lesser quantum a parking survey has been provided. The survey covers available parking within 200m of the site. The survey also includes the triangle sports centre car park, which should not be relied upon otherwise it could compromise the parking needs of the Sports Centre. In any event if the Sports Centre parking is full – as occasionally happens – guests will then look to park in neighbouring streets to the detriment of existing residential amenity.
- 6.3.3 When discounting the triangle, the survey still suggests that there are

sufficient free spaces in neighbouring streets to accommodate potential overspill to meet the maximum; the results show that on two separate dates (8th and 9th September 2021) there were 29 and 32 spaces available. Nevertheless, the survey fails to acknowledge, as the inspector did when considering the Compass House Appeal (**Appendix 4**, paragraphs 13 & 14) that logically most drivers would initially seek out spaces as close as possible to the hotel that they perceive to be safe. This would particularly be the case if they were carrying luggage and planned to leave the vehicle overnight. As such, the impacts of the need for overspill parking would be most keenly felt by those living closest. In these locations, and in particular the smaller residential streets closer to the site, the displacement of parking and noise and disturbance as a result of additional vehicles and associated waiting and movements would have an adverse effect on the residential amenities of local residents.

- 6.3.4 As the development would replace an office use the Council's Highways Engineers are of the opinion that the development would not cause significant highway impact in terms of trip generation or congestion. The proposal is also expected to have limited impact on the highway from its servicing requirements, in terms of obstruction, with it being agreed that kerbside refuse collection is adequate. In addition, if the application were approved site specific highways works would be required to improve the adjacent highway network where appropriate. Servicing requirements of the development are considered acceptable to the highway network as there would be a laundry provided on site, the number of bedspaces proposed is not likely to generate significant delivery requirements and the café would not have proportionally high associated delivery demands during peak traffic hours. The existing use of the site for office accommodation has also been considered which would have a greater potential trip generation at peak traffic hours.

6.4 Design and effect on character

- 6.4.1 Along with the policies set out in the Local Plan and Core Strategy (SDP1, SDP7, SDP9 & CS13) the development also needs to be judged against relevant policy that includes the Bassett Neighbourhood Plan (2016). Key policies in terms of character are BAS1 and BAS4 in particular:
- 6.4.2 BAS1 New Development: *Development proposals should be in keeping with the scale, massing and height of neighbouring buildings and with the density and landscape features of the surrounding area.*
- 6.4.3 The Urban Design Manager has not raised the scale of the building as a concern. The Panning Team appreciates how the building proposes to create a transition from two storey dwellings on Hill Lane up to four storeys on the corner and round to three stories adjacent to the flatted block on Winchester Road by use of pitched roofs. The link between the two main elements on the Hill Lane elevation helps to reduce the mass and bulk proposed. The

road layout in front of the building also provides a suitable setting which enables the Winchester Road elevation to be taller than the majority of other buildings nearby. The prominent corner also assists in justifying the scale proposed and in this case the guidance set out in paragraph 3.6.10 of the residential design guide is deemed to be relevant and supportive of the proposal: *'Taller buildings may be considered at street corners...'* The scheme also seeks to include a buffer within the site ensuring that the elevations do not meet the pavement edge; this will also help to balance the scale in the surroundings. Therefore, whilst the proposal does not match exactly the scale, massing and height of neighbouring buildings taking other relevant guidance into account the scheme is not judged to be significantly harmful to the overall appearance and character of the Winchester Road and Hill Lane corner position. Density is also less relevant as the use proposed is primarily within use class C1 – hotel, rather than C3 residential.

- 6.4.4 BAS4 Character and Design: *New development must take account of the densities set out in Policy BAS 5 and the existing character of the surrounding area. The design of new buildings should complement the street scene, with particular reference to the scale, spacing, massing, materials and height of neighbouring properties.*
- 6.4.5 For the reasons set out above in the response/commentary to BAS1 the proposal is also not deemed to be significantly at odds with BAS4. There is scope to bookend the street with a 4-storey scale building on this prominent corner and for variety including increase in scale provided that certain principles are followed. In this particular instance the transition of building height is considered sympathetic and use of pitched roofs reflect other properties in the location. The street is not homogenous and there are other buildings in the area which differ to the traditional two storey housing. It must also be recognised that the Council are under increasing pressure to accept larger scale and higher density for residential schemes, so the proposed building height and mass is considered appropriate in this context.
- 6.4.6 Having considered all aspects of the proposal and the characteristics of the location the Urban Design Manager is confident that the scheme will make a valuable contribution to the appearance of the neighbourhood; Officers do not disagree, but the Panel are free to reach a different conclusion although it should be noted that the defence of a design-led reason for refusal would be difficult for officers to defend in light of the above commentary.
- 6.4.7 The existing site is significantly covered by buildings and hard surfacing and therefore the proposal, which also seeks a significant building to plot ratio, is not opposed in principle.
- 6.5 Neighbouring residential amenity
- 6.5.1 Saved policies SDP1, SDP7, SDP9 of the Adopted Local Plan Review (2015) and the principles contained in the approved Residential Design Guide

(2006), amongst other things, seek to ensure that development will only be granted where it does not unacceptably affect the amenity of existing residents; integrates into the local community and respects its surroundings in terms of scale and massing.

6.5.2 The proposal seeks to replace 2 no.2 storey pitched roof buildings with a part three and part four storey building with three distinct elements:

1. Fronting Winchester Road section 1 has four storey's, a maximum height of 15m, roof pitching away from the boundary and would be positioned within 0.2m of the boundary with Nirvana Place.
2. The middle section places a roof terrace upon three storeys of accommodation; the top of the privacy screen would measure 10m in height and would be 5m from the boundary with Nirvana Place.
3. The final section would be adjacent to 171 Hill Lane, would have three storeys, a maximum height of 12m and would also be 0.2m from the boundary with Nirvana Place.

6.5.3 Notwithstanding the attempt to reduce impact on residents of Nirvana Place by including a stepped rear elevation and pitched roof, with a distance of between 0.2m and 5m; and maximum heights ranging between 10m and 15m the relationship would, due to its height, proximity to and depth of projection along the boundary, result in an intrusive, dominant, and overbearing effect which would be harmful to the living conditions of Nirvana Place. No significant impact is, however, deemed to occur on 171 Hill Lane when viewed from the rear garden due to the separation distance from the proposed building.

6.5.4 The proposal also seeks to add five windows within the rear elevations of sections 1 and 2 which would allow overlooking of the rear garden of Nirvana Place leading to a real loss of privacy.

6.5.5 The submitted BRE Daylight and Sunlight Assessment confirms no significant loss of sunlight or daylight to any neighbouring habitable rooms however during winter months there would be a reduction of direct sunlight received to the garden area serving Nirvana Place. The survey results show a 47% reduction of garden receiving 2 hours of direct sunlight on the spring equinox. The 47% reduction amounts to 40% of the garden receiving 2 hours of direct sunlight; the target set out in the BRE guidance is no less than 50%. Therefore, this impact is considered sufficient to contribute to a reason for refusal based on neighbour impact.

6.6 Quality of accommodation

6.6.1 The proposed layout would likely provide reasonable levels of privacy and outlook for occupiers of the proposed accommodation units. All units would also achieve acceptable daylight and ventilation. Noise impacts from the adjacent highway, the ground floor café and any required plant equipment

could be mitigated by Building Regulations or a planning condition.

- 6.6.2 With the proposal seeking 10% of the units to be occupied for more than three months they need to be judged against the Nationally Described Space Standards that require 50sq.m of floor area and 20sq.m of amenity space each. As the largest units proposed are 29sq.m and the roof terrace measures 31sq.m the development fails to provide suitable units for longer term occupation and should be refused for this reason.

6.7 Air Quality and the Green Charter

- 6.7.1 The Core Strategy Strategic Objective S18 seeks to ensure that air quality in the city is improved and Policy CS18 supports environmentally sustainable transport to enhance air quality, requiring new developments to consider impact on air quality through the promotion of sustainable modes of travel. Policy SDP15 of the Local Plan sets out that planning permission will be refused where the effect of the proposal would contribute significantly to the exceedance of the National Air Quality Strategy Standards.

- 6.7.2 There are 10 Air Quality Management Areas in the city which all exceed the nitrogen dioxide annual mean air quality standard. In 2015, Defra identified Southampton as needing to deliver compliance with EU Ambient Air Quality Directive levels for nitrogen dioxide by 2020, when the country as a whole must comply with the Directive.

- 6.7.3 The Council has also recently established its approach to deliver compliance with the EU limit and adopted a Green City Charter to improve air quality and drive – up environmental standards within the city. The Charter includes a goal of reducing emissions to satisfy World Health Organisation air quality guideline values by ensuring that, by 2025, the city achieves nitrogen dioxide levels of 25µg/m³. The Green Charter requires environmental impacts to be given due consideration in decision making and, where possible, deliver benefits. The priorities of the Charter are to:

- Reduce pollution and waste;
- Minimise the impact of climate change
- Reduce health inequalities and;
- Create a more sustainable approach to economic growth.

- 6.7.4 The application has partially addressed the Green Charter and the air quality impact of the development by identifying an acceptable sustainable drainage system for the site and planning conditions could be used to secure energy and water efficiency improvements along with biodiversity enhancement measures.

6.8 Mitigation of direct local impacts

6.8.1 The application also needs to address and mitigate the additional pressure on the social and economic infrastructure of the city, in accordance with Development Plan policies and the Council's adopted Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document. Given the impacts associated with a development of this scale, the package of contributions and obligations required would be limited to the following:

- i. financial contributions towards site specific transport improvements in the vicinity of the site.
- ii. a highways condition survey to make good any possible damage to the public highway in the course of construction.
- iii. Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project (SDMP) and New Forest Mitigation.
- iv. Employment and skills.
- v. Staff & customer travel plan.
- vi. Obligations to limit duration of occupation.

7.0 Summary

7.1 Whilst the principle of an apart hotel is accepted and the need proven the proposal fails to provide adequate car parking on site causing unacceptable increased pressure for on street parking. The height and depth of projection, and position of windows close to the boundary would have an overbearing and unduly dominant impact leading to an unacceptable sense of enclosure, shading and loss of neighbouring privacy. The living environment is also not deemed acceptable for stays longer than 3 months and planning obligations have not been secured to offset the impact of the development locally.

8.0 Conclusion

8.1 The positive aspects of the scheme are judged to be outweighed by the negative impacts, namely on street parking pressure closest to the site, neighbour impact, quality of the residential accommodation and failure to secure planning obligations; and as such the scheme is recommended for refusal.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Documents used in the preparation of this report Background Papers

1. (a) (b) (c) (d) 2. (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) 4.(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (r) (ll) (vv) 6 (a) (b)

Mathew Pidgeon for 01/11/2022 PROW Panel

Application 22/00737/FUL
APPENDIX 1

POLICY CONTEXT

Core Strategy - (as amended 2015)

CS4 – Housing Delivery
CS5 – Housing Density
CS13 – Fundamentals of Design
CS14 – Historic Environment
CS15 – Affordable Housing
CS16 – Housing Mix and Type
CS18 – Transport
CS19 – Car and Cycle Parking
CS20 – Tackling and adapting to Climate Change
CS22 – Biodiversity and Protected Species
CS25 – Delivery of Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

City of Southampton Local Plan Review – (as amended 2015)

SDP1 – Quality of Development
SDP4 – Development Access
SDP5 – Parking
SDP6 – Urban Design Principles
SDP8 – Urban Form and Public Space
SDP9 – Scale, Massing and Appearance
SDP10 – Safety and Security
SDP11 – Accessibility and Movement
SDP12 – Landscape and Biodiversity
SDP13 – Resource Conservation
SDP14 – Renewable Energy
H1 – Housing Supply
H2 – Previously Developed Land
H7 – The Residential Environment

Bassett Neighbourhood Development Plan 'made' 2016

BAS 1 New Development
BAS 2 Consultation
BAS 3 Windfall Sites
BAS 4 Character and Design
BAS 5 Housing Density
BAS 7 Highways and Traffic
BAS 9 Trees

BAS 12 Business and Industry
BAS13 Southampton Sports Centre and Southampton City Golf Course
BAS 14 Drainage

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Residential Design Guide (Approved - September 2006)

Planning Obligations (Adopted - September 2013)

Parking Standards SPD (September 2011)

Other Relevant Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

The Southampton Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (September 2013)