

The Development Sites and Policies Plan

Issue 4: Employment (including Development Site Briefs) (DSP17 – DSP19)

Actions arising from hearing session

December 2014

DCD-22

Introduction

Chapter 5 of the Development Sites & Policies Plan is titled “Planning for Growth” in the Borough, and covers issues such as Employment, Retail and Housing. At the Development Sites & Policies Examination hearing session on Issue 4: Employment (DSP17 – DSP19), a number of pieces of work were requested by the Inspector and some additional work was offered by the Council to address the points raised at the hearing session. These are set out in this note.

Specifically, this note addresses the following;

1. Council to set out the role of the Solent Strategic Economic Plan and the Marine & Maritime Supplement and how these have been taken account of in LP2. Council to add both documents to the Library of submission documents.
2. Council to consider whether Table 3 of LP2 (page 44), regarding Employment provision, can be further clarified.
3. Council to provide further clarity on its approach to Open Storage uses in LP2.
4. Council to explain the detail of the Fareham Employment Study (DED01) in relation to Solent 2.
5. Council to consider the clarity of the wording of the bullet points at the end of Policy DSP17.
6. Council to provide further justification for the allocation of Little Park Farm and Solent 2 for employment use.
7. Council to re-consider the wording of the Site Briefs for employment allocations, specifically the reference to “low density” employment at Little Park Farm and whether the site size (and site boundary) provided for Solent 2 is correct.

1. Council to set out the role of the Solent Strategic Economic Plan and the Marine & Maritime Supplement and how these have been taken account of in LP2. Council to add both documents to the Library of submission documents

- 1.1 The Solent LEP published its first Strategy for Growth in December 2012, this helped to set the priorities for growth across the Solent Area, it was closely aligned with the South Hampshire Strategy published by PUSH (DPH01). In preparing the Fareham Employment Study in 2014 (DED01) Wessex Economics drew heavily on the high level assessment of supply and demand for employment floorspace undertaken in the PUSH area in June/July 2013. This approach has ensured consistency between the LP2 and the wider South Hampshire employment strategies.
- 1.2 The Solent Strategic Economic Plan (SEP), titled “Transforming Solent” (DED06), was published in March 2014 with the aim of setting a plan for growth in the Solent area. The SEP contains six strategic priorities:
 - Supporting new businesses, enterprise and ensuring SME survival and growth;
 - Enabling infrastructure priorities including land assets, transport and housing, reducing flood risk and improving access to superfast broadband;

- Establishing a single inward investment model to encourage companies to open new sites in the region, supported by effective marketing;
- Investing in skills to establish a sustainable pattern of growth, ensuring local residents are equipped to take up the jobs that are created and businesses can source local skills and labour to underpin growth;
- Developing strategic sectors and clusters (interconnected groups and businesses) or marine, aerospace and defence, advance manufacturing, engineering, transport and logistics businesses, low carbon, digital and creative and the visitor economy – establishing the area as a business gateway, at both local and international levels and developing local supply chains.
- Building on our substantial knowledge assets to support innovation and build innovative capacity in the Solent area to stimulate growth in Solent businesses and in new high growth sectors, particularly linked to our HE excellence. (SEP page 5)

1.3 The Solent Strategic Economic Plan has been refreshed by the publication of the Transforming Solent Growth Strategy in October 2014 (DED06). This document sets out the strategy for channelling the various funding streams available to the LEP, which will unlock investment in the Solent Area of around £1.5 billion between 2014-20, in order to deliver growth and transformational change. The main focus of the Growth Strategy is;

- Unlocking sites for housing and employment
- Improving connectivity within the Solent and beyond
- Stimulating and supporting innovation
- Improving skills
- Supporting business growth; and
- Supporting key strategic sectors

The Growth Strategy identifies ‘flagship sites for housing and employment’ which includes Daedalus, Welborne and Whiteley, and sets the target of an additional 15,500 new jobs, but it does not set any specific floorspace targets.

1.4 The growth targets set out in the SEP (page 6 and 16) are around job creation, GVA growth, productivity, skills, business survival rates and the enabling of new homes. It does not set specific floorspace targets for employment floorspace provision. In terms of achieving the growth planned, the SEP (chapter 3) identifies strengths and weaknesses, with one of the perceived opportunities being the existing supply of land for development. This is expanded upon further in Annex 2, where it states that “there is a reasonable supply of land to unlock employment and housing sites”. This section supports the employment floorspace targets, and distribution strategy, from the South Hampshire Strategy 2012 (DPH01). The SEP states that the figure from the South Hampshire Strategy 2012 “exceeds what is likely to be built, even if/when the economy improves, in order to ensure that **land supply is not a constraint on employment development.**” Given that the figures in LP2 mirror those from the South Hampshire Strategy, it is clear that the SEP endorses this approach.

- 1.5 A key output from the SEP is the identification of key sites which will help deliver the overall strategic priorities. Included in these key sites are Welborne, Daedalus and North Whiteley. Welborne is allocated in the Core Strategy (DLP02) and will be delivered through LP3 (Welborne Plan). Daedalus is also allocated through the Core Strategy. Whilst North Whiteley is located outside of the Borough, part of the wider Whiteley settlement, and a significant proportion of the employment land, is within the Borough, and the delivery of North Whiteley will be supported by delivery of employment adjacent to junction 9 of the M27, including Solent 2. What this demonstrates is that the Local Plan, between its three parts, does include all relevant land that is highlighted in the key sites within the SEP, and its companion Growth Plan.
- 1.6 A key strength of the area is considered to be the marine and maritime sector, based on the Solent's coastal location, clustering of businesses and natural assets. This has been explored further in the Marine and Maritime Supplement (DED07) that was produced in April 2014. The purpose of the Supplement was to examine further the role of the marine and maritime sector in the sub-region and to recommend how the success in this sector can be maintained and expanded upon. The document includes 36 recommendations across 6 themes; leadership, developing our ports, marine manufacturing, technology and innovation, skills and brand Solent. The Supplement includes a section on the importance of Logistics in the sub-region, and highlights that PUSH studies which identify a potential shortfall of 4,000,000sq.m of warehouse and distribution space across the sub-region. It is important to note that the 2012 SHS (DPH01) makes a target, across the sub-region, of just under 6,000,000sq.m of B2/B8 floorspace across the Plan period. A proportion of this SHS target has been incorporated within LP2. The Supplement specifically mentions 3 sites that can be utilised to meet logistic needs, but none are within Fareham Borough. It also refers to the importance of a future "Solent-wide logistics review", which has not yet been started. Once this review has been completed Fareham Borough Council will, where necessary, take account of any recommendations in the future review of the Local Plan.
- 1.7 The Supplement also emphasises the importance of protecting waterside sites and commits to a review of such sites in the future. The Council, through Policy DSP19 of LP2, already commits to protecting the Borough's boatyards. One of the most important waterside sites in the sub-region is Daedalus, which is allocated through LP1 (DLP02). The Core Strategy (Policy CS12) allocates Daedalus for employment purposes but includes a criteria stating that development must "retain and strengthen the marine and aviation employment clusters". The Council believes, therefore, that through the policies in LP1 and LP2, important waterside sites have been identified and protected. The Council will welcome the review of such sites in due course.
- 1.8 The main purpose of the SEP, and its supplementary document, is to identify strategic priorities and also to identify where funding should be focussed. It is not a basis for determining the floorspace targets or growth targets for individual authorities. The figures for housing and employment growth used in the SEP, and its supplementary documentation, come from the 2012 South Hampshire Strategy Review, which have been fully taken account of within LP2. The other strategic priorities within the SEP are acknowledged, and supported by Fareham Borough Council, but do not have a

spatial planning element that requires definition within the Local Plan. To that end, the Council believes it has had sufficient regard to the SEP, including its supplementary documentation, within LP2. Furthermore, in preparing the LP2 the Council has consulted with both the LEP and PUSH who have raised no issues with the Council's economic or employment policies.

- 1.9 Notwithstanding the above, the Council believes that reference to the SEP should be made in LP2, most notably in terms of the future review of the Plan. To that end the Council is recommending a modification to paragraph 1.10 to reflect that the review will enable the Council to reflect future evidence that comes out of the Solent LEP, with new text underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~:

The Council recognises the need for an early review of the Local Plan following adoption of the Development Sites & Policies Plan to extend the time horizon beyond 2026, in line with the Welborne Plan, to 2036. The review of the South Hampshire Strategy to 2036 will inform the early review of Fareham's Local Plan. This is considered to be the most sound and robust approach to taking account of new evidence, including the SHMA, as well as guidance and evidence produced by the South Hampshire Local Economic Partnership, whilst ensuring the Council fulfils the Duty to Cooperate.

2. Council to consider whether Table 3 of LP2 (page 44), regarding Employment provision, can be further clarified.

- 2.1 Table 3 of LP2 sets out the employment floorspace supply in the Borough between 2011 and 2026. The purpose is to demonstrate how the employment floorspace requirements recommending in the Fareham Employment Study (DED01) can be met through various sources. Discussions at the hearings revolved around the clarity of the table, especially in light of the column labelled (B1-B8). The Council contends that it is advantageous for some sites, and allocations, to not be restricted to certain uses as this aids flexibility.
- 2.2 However, it is acknowledged that for the purposes of demonstrating how employment targets can be met there is benefit in giving further clarity, which can be achieved by removing this B1-B8 column and apportioning the contents to either B1 or B2/B8 columns depending on the most likely or suitable employment use. Having reviewed previous completions, permissions and the allocations at Little Park Farm and Kites Croft, it was concluded that in all cases the use (actual or proposed) was not likely to be for B1 offices, and therefore they have been included in the B2/B8 column. To reflect this the Council is proposing the following modifications to Table 3, as shown below, with new text underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~:

Table 3: Employment Floorspace Supply 2011-2026

| Source | B1 | B2/B8 | B1-B8 | Total |
|------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|
| Completions 2011-2013 | 200 | 1,030 <u>1,300</u> | 270 | 1,500 |
| Excess Vacancies | 3,400 | 8,600 | | 12,000 |
| Permissions | 25,800 | <u>7,100</u> | 7,100 | 32,900 |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Potential Sites | | | | |
| Solent Enterprise Zone | 2,300 | 47,900 | | 50,200 |
| Little Park Farm | | 11,200 | 11,200 | 11,200 |
| Kites Croft | | 3,090 | 3,090 | 3,090 |
| Welborne | 4,400 | 15,900 | | 20,300 |
| Total | 36,100 | 73,430 95,090 | 21,660 | 131,190 |
| | | | | |
| Requirement | 40,700 | 59,400 | 0 | 100,100 |
| | | | | |
| Surplus/Deficit | -4,600 | +14,030 +35,690 | +21,660 | +31,090 |

3. Council to provide further clarity on its approach to Open Storage uses in LP2.

- 3.1 The Council set out its general approach to Open Storage uses in the Council's statement on Issues & Questions, in response to question 4.8 (pages 11-12 in DCD-08). Open Storage uses do not have their own specific use class, but, instead, fall under the B8 classification. There is no national policy or guidance position that recommends allocating land specifically for this use, and it is not specifically mentioned in any sub-region or local evidence as having an outstanding need, over and above the requirements set out in the Fareham Employment Study (DED01).
- 3.2 The Fareham Employment Study sets a recommended requirement for 59,400sq.m of B2/B8 or which 50,600sq.m is for B8 uses. Table 3 of LP2 (updated as part of Council's item 2 in this document) highlights that there is currently a supply of 95,090sq.m of potential B2/B8 floorspace, giving a healthy 35,690sq.m surplus. This surplus, alongside the flexibility of the employment policies in LP2, will allow open storage uses to be delivered where there is sufficient market demand. The Council is aware that not all the allocations within the Plan will be suitable for open storage uses, but the Council does consider that there is potential to deliver such uses at Little Park Farm and Midpoint 27. Little Park Farm was previously the subject of pre-application discussions for such uses, which is detailed in the statement submitted by the agent, on behalf of the landowner of Little Park Farm, prior to the Examination hearings (DREP234-001). This demonstrates that there is substantial scope for new open storage uses to be delivered through the existing allocations in the Plan.
- 3.3 The Council has not been presented with evidence to demonstrate that there is a market for such uses that cannot be accommodated in existing sites or on one of the allocations in LP2, especially in light of the previously mentioned surplus. Whilst the Council acknowledges that part of a previously allocated site for open storage in Segensworth has been lost to B1 offices, there remains a certain proportion of open storage land currently in use across the Borough. This existing open storage land, plus the potential healthy surplus of B2/B8 land in the Borough's employment supply, is considered sufficient to meet existing demand without the need to allocate specific sites.

- 3.4 The Council will monitor the delivery of employment land across the Borough as part of the monitoring systems which will be put in place through LP2. If, through the monitoring of employment permissions, existing open storage facilities are continually lost to other uses and no new open storage facilities are provided on existing allocations the Council will need to consider the allocation of specific sites for this use in the future review of the Local Plan.

4. Council to explain the detail of the Fareham Employment Study (DED01) in relation to Solent 2.

- 4.1 The Fareham Employment Study (DED01) was undertaken by Wessex Economics at the end of 2013 and published at the start of 2014. Its findings, including recommended floorspace requirements and conclusions on specific sites, have been fully incorporated into LP2.
- 4.2 With regards to Solent 2 site the Study considers this in detail, alongside other key sites in chapter 6, titled “Delivery, Marketability and Choice”. Pages 38-43 of the Study give provide a balanced argument on the suitability of Solent 2 as an employment allocation. The assessment of the site begins within some background information on the site, including its planning background before discussion about the location. The opening section concludes that “market perception is that this location is good for employers”, however it also notes that motorway congestion and parking (especially in the Solent Business Park 1) are issues that have arisen from the success of Whiteley as an employment location.
- 4.3 The assessment moves on to discuss the existing development at the wider business park, with reference to 20,000sq.m of vacant office floorspace (at the time of the assessment) and capacity for 42,000sq.m of addition floorspace yet to be built out. This vacant floorspace, and further capacity, is within the boundary of Winchester City Council and is currently allocated for employment uses in their adopted Local Plan. The Study considers the proposed uses, commenting that the current owners are seeking alternative options as a result of “a combination of the weakness of the market for employment floorspace” as well as the amount of vacant and potential land at that exists at Solent 1. However, it also states that “the site is well located and suitable for B1 uses” and notes that Fareham has no other significant sites available for office development. In terms of delivery, the conclusion is that access is already provided and there is no need for further public infrastructure, leaving the only barrier being the competition from existing space in the market.
- 4.4 The Study analyses the future role of the site, considering trends in vacancy rates in the local area, through which it highlights signs of recovery in the local market. The Study did engage with local agents, with a general view that the site is “unlikely to come forward for development any time soon”, with a general perception that owners are likely to want to let existing office floorspace before turning to new builds. However, one agent noted that “if the site is retained for employment uses over the course of the next economic cycle, the site could be built out within this timeframe”. There is a note to competition from Lakeside Business Park, which is within

Portsmouth, with the Study noting that the wider Solent Business Park faces a challenge being located mid-way between the two principal employment poles of Portsmouth and Southampton.

- 4.5 The final section about Solent 2 brings the various strands of the discussion together in discussing the “role of Solent 2 in the Fareham Development Plan”. Whilst the site makes up the majority of employment land in the Borough for B1 uses, the existence of vacant floorspace and competition in the sub-region presents a challenge. The study states that “a wider strategic analysis might indicate that there is sufficient capacity for B1 development in the M27 corridor without the retention of that part of Solent 2 that is within Fareham for B1 development in the period to 2021.” However, this is countered by the recognition of the difficulty in predicting the pattern of office take up, especially after a prolonged period of recession, leading to a conclusion that, at this stage, releasing Solent 2 would be premature.
- 4.6 The Study concludes that “if the South Hampshire economy really picks up and significant occupier requirements materialise, the Fareham part of Solent Business Park 2 might come into its own”, and that “the prospects for development before 2026 are reasonable”. This general conclusion of the site analysis is reflected in the overall conclusion and executive summary of the Study. The overall conclusions of the Study (chapter 7, pages 52-54) summarise the earlier debates and state that “from a Fareham perspective it would be important to ensure that the Solent 2 Business Park allocation for B1a office use is retained”. Although the competition from neighbouring areas is noted, the final sentence on the matter notes that “a cautious approach to release of land allocated at Solent Business Park 2 is appropriate”.
- 4.7 The level of detail within the Fareham Employment Study regarding Solent 2 reflects the importance of the site, in terms of delivering the floorspace to meet identified needs of the Borough, but also the complexity of assessing whether the site is deliverable. However, on balance, the Study concludes that it would be premature to release the site at this stage as there remains a reasonable prospect of delivery within the Plan period. To that end, reflecting the requirements of NPPF paragraph 22, the re-allocation of the site within LP2 for employment uses is considered justified.

5. Council to consider the clarity of the wording of the bullet points at the end of DSP17.

- 5.1 The bullet points at the end of Policy DSP17 relate to the criteria by which the Council will assess applications on existing employment sites that would result in the loss of floorspace from economic development uses. The first bullet point relates to alternative economic development uses being considered in the first instance. This is to ensure that where a certain economic development use is no longer suitable in a certain location, alternative economic development uses will be considered before other uses (such as residential) are allowed. However, it is noted that there are some economic development uses are not suitable in certain locations, for example retail use in non-centre locations. This point is covered, in part by an earlier part of DSP17 which states that any proposal for “main town centre uses” will only be

permitted where they accord with the Policy on out-of-town shopping (Policy DSP37).

- 5.2 The second bullet point relates to financial viability and ensuring buildings are fit for purpose. The justification for this is to allow for changes of use away from economic development where the existing building is not up to modern standards, thus rendering it difficult to let or sell, and it would be unviable to modernise. Again, it is noted that the role of this bullet point could be clarified by a minor amendment to the wording.
- 5.3 The last bullet point states that evidence of marketing for a twelve month period must be submitted to justify the loss of a unit/building from economic development use. This is to ensure that suitable attempts have been made to re-let or sell the unit before alternative uses are considered. Questions were raised as to the meaning of the word “extensive” in relation to the level of marketing details expected to accompany individual applications and the Council acknowledges this could be clarified.
- 5.4 The following modifications to the wording of paragraph 5.17 are proposed to clarify the Council’s approach, with new text underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~:

Where it can clearly be demonstrated that a building or site in one of the Borough's existing employment areas is no longer suitable and viable for economic development uses, alternative uses may be considered. However, all appropriate alternative forms of economic development should be considered before other uses, such as housing, will be deemed acceptable. A comprehensive marketing exercise over a twelve-month period, ending within 3 months of the submission of the planning application, should be completed prior to an application being submitted, in order to clearly demonstrate a site’s lack of suitability for economic development uses. In order to establish whether the marketing exercise has been satisfactorily comprehensive, applicants will be expected to submit details of the length of the vacancy, the agents used to promote the sale/letting (including contact details), advertising methods used, information regarding any interest received during that time and why any interest (if any) was not pursued.

- 5.5 In addition the following amendment to the wording of the end of Policy DSP17 is proposed:

Changes of use or redevelopment within the ~~existing~~ employment areas that would result in a loss of floorspace for economic development uses will ~~be not~~ be permitted unless:

- **All appropriate alternative forms of economic development have been considered;**
- **It can be clearly demonstrated that the land or building is not fit for purpose and is ~~modernisation or redevelopment for employment uses~~ would be financially unviable; and**
- **The proposal is accompanied by details of extensive marketing of the**

vacant site/building covering a period of not fewer than twelve months.

6. Council to provide further justification for the allocation of Little Park Farm and Solent 2 for employment use.

- 6.1 The Council considers both Little Park Farm and Solent 2 to be sound employment allocations that have a reasonable prospect of delivery during the Plan period. Both sites have been allocated in light of up-to-date and relevant evidence, such as the Fareham Employment Study (DED01) and the Employment Land Review (DED02), alongside market signals and information from landowners. The Employment Study identified a need for 100,100sq.m of employment floorspace within the Borough over the Plan period, and the delivery of both these sites will make an important contribution to this.
- 6.2 Little Park Farm was originally allocated in the Local Plan Review 2000 (DLP01) and whilst there are no concerns over the suitability of the location for employment purposes, access to the site has always been the greatest barrier to delivery. This is acknowledged in the Employment Study (pages 49-50 of DED01), the Employment Land Review (paragraphs 6.28-6.29 of DED02) and its Appendix (page 139 of DED02a) as well as in LP2 itself (paragraph 5.25). Current access to the site is via a narrow, and relatively low, rail bridge via Little Park Farm Road. Any improvements to the access requiring works to the bridge would require agreement with Network Rail.
- 6.3 However, to alleviate concerns regarding the access, the Council has received a further statement from the agents, acting on behalf of the landowners, clarifying their progress and current position. This statement is included, in full, as Appendix 1 and contains confirmation that one of the two options for the site can be delivered without any amendments to the bridge being necessary. This option (Option B), which is set out in more detail in the statement received prior to the hearings (DREP234-001), seeks to provide open storage across the site. This demonstrates that an option to bring the site forward in the short term does exist, and can be delivered without works to the bridge, and so without the perceived barrier of gaining agreement from Network Rail. Appendix 1 does confirm that the preferred option for the site is "Option A", which involves a more comprehensive redevelopment. This Option would require amendments to the bridge, which, in turn, will require approval from Network Rail. Appendix 1 confirms that discussions with Network Rail are ongoing and detailed work on developing design solutions have commenced.
- 6.4 The Council believes that this latest statement (Appendix 1) demonstrates that significant progress on delivering an improved access solution has been made. Improvements to the bridge, which require Network Rail approval, are the preferred solution. However, even if such improvements are not deliverable in the short-medium term an option still exists that could see significant employment floorspace delivered without requiring any Network Rail approval. The further detail on overall deliverability of the site, which was submitted by the agent, on behalf of the landowner, as a statement prior to the Examination hearings (DREP234-001), clearly clarifies that the landowners have invested significantly in the amalgamation of land on the site. This information, alongside the knowledge that suitable access can be

delivered, with or without the requirement of Network Rail approval, is considered to be adequate evidence of deliverability, and, therefore, adequate justification for the continued allocation of the site in LP2.

- 6.5 Like Little Park Farm, Solent 2 was allocated in the Local Plan Review 2000 (DLP01) but despite an extant permission being granted and development commencing, a potential occupier has not been found. Whilst the Council is aware that there has been some marketing of the site since permission was originally granted for the wider Solent Business Park, the location of Solent 2, on the outskirts of the Business Park, ensured it was always likely to be one of the latter parcels to be developed. The recent recession is also a major factor in the lack of development on site, with the dual impact of not only ensuring limited market interest in employment across the Country, but also causing higher than average vacancy rates in existing built employment stock elsewhere, including the rest of Solent Business Park and Segensworth.
- 6.6 The wording of the NPPF (paragraph 22) is clear that Local Plan's 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.*" Justifying the inclusion of Solent 2 as a re-allocation for employment purposes therefore relies on there being a reasonable prospect of delivery during the Plan period. The Fareham Employment Study (DED01) discusses the site, and its deliverability, in detail, which is discussed in more detail in the Council's item 4 in this document. The overall conclusion of the Study is that there is a reasonable prospect of the site delivering employment floorspace during the Plan period.
- 6.7 The Employment Land Review (DED02), alongside the Employment Study (DED01) and table 3 of LP2 demonstrate the importance of the site in order to meet the overall employment floorspace requirements for the Borough, especially for B1 offices. The Council considers that the contribution the site would make to employment provision, coupled with the conclusion from the Employment Study (DED01) that the site has a reasonable prospect of delivery during the Plan period, provides suitable justification for the site to be allocated for the proposed use.

7. Council to re-consider the wording of the Site Briefs for employment allocations, specifically the reference to "low density" employment at Little Park Farm and whether the site size (and site boundary) provided for Solent 2 is correct.

- 7.1 The Council has considered the wording of the submitted version of LP2 in relation to the site briefs for Solent 2 (E1) and Little Park Farm (E2) following comments made during the Examination hearing sessions.
- 7.2 For Solent 2 (E1) concerns were raised by the agent representing the landowner that the site area did not reflect the "red line" boundary of the extant planning permission, which could influence potential section 106 contributions if a revised application was submitted. However, having reviewed the situation the Council is satisfied that the boundary in the submitted version in the Plan represents the developable area as defined in the extant permission. Whilst alternative proposals may be possible on

the wider site (which is in the same ownership) this must take into account the areas designated as SINC. Any alternative proposal would need to show all land in the developers ownership within a “blue line” boundary, therefore any section 106 contributions the Council deemed necessary for the wider site could still be considered. The Council contends that the revised boundary provides a greater degree of clarity in terms of which part of the site is considered to be important for SINC purposes and which part is considered suitable for development.

- 7.3 For Little Park Farm (E2) the Inspector questioned the clarity of the wording “low intensity” in relation to the amount of floorspace that could be provided. To clarify this issue the Council recommends removing the words “low intensity” in the Potential Use row of the Development Site Brief. The presence of a potential floorspace target in this brief should provide sufficient guidance and clarity to potential developers. The table row will now look as follows, with new text underlined and deleted text ~~struck through~~:

| | |
|--|---|
| Potential Use and Indicative Floorspace Capacity | Employment floorspace (low intensity B1, B2 or B8) of approximately 11,200sq.m” |
|--|---|

Appendix 1: Further Statement from Agent, on behalf of Landowner, regarding deliverability of Little Park Farm site for Employment Use



Mr Mark Chevis

Our Ref: WIN/483/AP

Planning and Building Control

Your Ref:

Fareham Borough Council

Email: andy@southernplanning.co.uk

Civic Offices

Date: 17 December 2013

Civic Way

Status: Urgent

Fareham PO16 7AZ

Dear Mark

Request from the Inspector to the Council to Provide further Justification for the Allocation of Little Park Farm Site

Following our discussions concerning the above I can offer you the following additional information.

As we were not invited by the Examination Inspector to attend in person to give evidence, I am reliant on your feedback. However, I understand the nub of the issue is that the Inspector is concerned about the timing and ability to upgrade the bridge in order to access the site.

As detailed in my earlier proof, but is worth highlighting again, Option B provides a means to access the site without affecting the infrastructure of the bridge or needing Network Rail Property Board's approval. In other words the site could be accessed relatively easily under Option B but of course Option A remains the longer term preference since it provides for a more intensive development as the site would then have better accessibility.

The design process has already been commenced and the preliminary designs prepared by Gyoury Self have been presented to Network Rail and, as I understand it, progressed through Governance Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) Stages 1 and 2 and the client is ready to embark on GRIP Stage 3. In this regard specialist rail structure engineers, Crouch Waterfall, have been appointed to finalise designs for Network Rail's Permanent Works, forms 1, 2 and 3 process.

In order to progress stage 3 a Basic Asset Protection Agreement (BAPA) is required when you enter GRIP Stage 3, which is when Network Rail's own internal and external engineers/other consultants start running up costs. Network Rail requires a landowner/developer to enter into a BAPA to protect Network Rail's position in respect of recovery of such costs if the project does not go ahead. It is effectively an indemnity "wrapper". However, this can only be subsequent to having concluded the Shared Value Agreement with Network Rail Property Board

SOUTHERN PLANNING PRACTICE LTD

Registered Office: Youngs Yard, Churchfields, Twyford, Winchester SO21 1NN

Tel: 01962 715770 Fax: 01962 715880 E-mail: info@southernplanning.co.uk Website: www.southernplanning.co.uk
Registered in England and Wales No. 3862030



As above, the Shared Value Agreement is not necessary for the purposes of option B but this will need to be concluded in the longer term for the purposes of Option A.

The attached email from Chris Atkinson acting on behalf Network Rail has confirmed that negotiations have re-commenced to progress the BAPA.

I have not yet been able to obtain a timeline from Network Rail. Our Specialist Engineers, Crouch Waterfall, indicated that approval for Permanent Works as above would normally take 6 to 9 months

It is true to say that discussions had foundered because of the Gerrards Cross Tunnel collapse prompting a review of rail track engineering operations but are now progressing again and are reasonably well advanced. Finally, I should say that Option A was/is the preferred choice by Network Rail when put forward by Osbornes (on my client's behalf) to Network Rail. However, Option B will be pursued as an interim solution to opening up of the site.

Yours sincerely

Andy Partridge

Director

Cc Frobisher

SOUTHERN PLANNING PRACTICE LTD

Registered Office: Youngs Yard, Churchfields, Twyford, Winchester SO21 1NN

Tel: 01962 715770 Fax: 01962 715880 E-mail: info@southernplanning.co.uk Website: www.southernplanning.co.uk
Registered in England and Wales No. 3862030

From: Chris Atkinson [mailto:chris@masonsproperty.co.uk]

Sent: 07 November 2014 18:59

To: Nigel Wolstenholme

Subject: RE: Hayling Farm Bridge E15/37

Nigel

Sorry to be a bit slow coming back to you but I now have instructions from Network Rail to progress discussions.

Perhaps we could discuss how we can move this forward, early next week.

Regards

Chris

Chris Atkinson

Masons Property Advisers

www.masonsproperty.co.uk

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7629 0550

Fax +44 (0) 20 7629 0779